Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-121
Monday
24 June 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-121 *24 June 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: • indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ALBANIA

Reportage on U.S. Secretary of State's Visit 1
ATA Reviews Press Coverage of Visit 1
'Enthusiastic Rally' Greets Baker *[Tirana Radio]* 1
Prime Minister Receives Baker *[ATA]* 2
Ramiz Alia Receives Baker *[ATA]* 3
Bufi Addresses Rally *[ATA]* 5
ATA Reports Arrival, Activities 5
ATA Reports on Departure 5

BULGARIA

Zhelev Speaks at SDS National Conference *[BTA]* 6
SDS Address to Electorate Reported *[BTA]* 6
Views Unity Problems *[BTA]* 7
Zhelev Discusses Foreign Policy Priorities *[BTA]* 7
Popov on Interest Rate, Talks With Gorbachev *[POGLED 17 Jun]* 7
Poll Reflects Optimism for Economic Recovery *[BTA]* 9
Yonchev Says SS-23 Missiles Vital for Security *[DUMA 14 Jun]* 9

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Havel Grants Weekly 'Lany' Interview *[Prague Radio]* 10
Prime Minister Marian Calfa Interviewed 12
Government Screening Process *[MLADA FRONTA DNES 20 Jun]* 12
Speaks on Federation Talks *[Prague TV]* 13
Slovak Prime Minister on Federation Talks *[Bratislava Radio]* 15
Slovak Legislature Debates Constitution *[NARODNA OBRODA 20 Jun]* 16
Slovak VPN Conference Adopts Communique *[Bratislava Radio]* 18
Public Against Violence Rejects Slovak Separation *[CTK]* 18

HUNGARY

Antall Addresses Democratic Forum Session *[MTI]* 19
Troop Withdrawal Compensation Talks Continue 19
Defense Ministry Report *[MTI]* 19
Military Official on Talks *[MTI]* 19
Comment on Deadlock *[Budapest Radio]* 20
Soldiers Staying 'Illegally' *[Budapest TV]* 20
Energy Price Hikes Compensation Accepted *[Budapest Radio]* 20

POLAND

Sejm Rejects Senate Amendments to Electoral Law *[Warsaw Radio]* 21
Walesa Threatens To Dissolve Parliament *[Warsaw TV]* 21
ZCHN Expresses Concern Over Electoral Debate *[PAP]* 22
Parties View President-Sejm 'Conflict' *[Warsaw Radio]* 22
'Solidarity' Leaders Discuss Political Role *[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC 14 Jun]* 23

ROMANIA

Nastase Reviews Berlin CSCE Meeting *[ROMPRES]* 26
FSN Condemns Extremist, Chauvinist Articles *[ROMPRES]* 26

YUGOSLAVIA

Markovic Outlines Solutions to Crisis *[TANJUG]* 27
Markovic Calls For Peaceful Settlement *[TANJUG]* 32
Markovic Appeals for Peaceful End to Crisis *[TANJUG]* 33
Markovic Warns of 'Disintegration' of Society *[TANJUG]* 33
Says Cost 'Enormous' *[TANJUG]* 34
Markovic: Bosnian Developments Will Decide Fate *[TANJUG]* 34
Republican Leaders Hold Talks With Baker *[TANJUG]* 34
TANJUG Notes Baker's 'Gloomy' Departure 36
Baker Meets With Kosovo Albanians in Belgrade *[TANJUG]* 37
Statement Issued on Baker-Milosevic Talks *[Belgrade RTV]* 37
Baker Views Talks 'Very Successful' *[TANJUG]* 37
Press on Presidency's Failure To Hold Session *[TANJUG]* 37
Army Reportedly Supports Democratic Changes *[TANJUG]* 38
Slovenia, Croatia To Declare Independence Jointly *[TANJUG]* 38
Slovene, Croatian Presidents View Dissociation *[TANJUG]* 39
Reaction From Army Not Expected *[Belgrade Radio]* 39
Peterle Views Secession, National Borders *[Belgrade RTV]* 39
Slovene Presidency Responds to Loncar Speech *[Ljubljana Radio]* 40
Presidency Protests Army Removal of Planes *[TANJUG]* 41
Relations Within Croatia Concern Only Croatia *[TANJUG]* 41
Croatia's Manolic Interviewed on Secession *[Belgrade RTV]* 41
Izetbegovic on Imminent Division of Republic *[Vienna PROGIL 24 Jun]* 42

Reportage on U.S. Secretary of State's Visit

ATA Reviews Press Coverage of Visit

AU2206143691 Tirana ATA in English 0931 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Excerpt] Tirana, June 22 (ATA)— "Welcome Mr. Baker." This is the head line in capital letters on the frontpages of all newspapers. "Rallies in Honour of the Great Friend", "Welcome Mr. Baker", "Message of Friendship" are the titles of the writings the newspaper "RILINDJA DEMOKRATIKE", organ of the Democratic Party of Albania carries today on occasion of the visit to our country of the representative of the greatest economic and political power, of the most democratic country in the world. "The visit of the Secretary of the U.S. State Department James Baker in our country, one of these writing stresses, has been for several days now in the focus of our conversations. Its repercussion is spread throughout the country, thus being a source of hope and optimism to overcome the grave economic crisis and the grave crisis of trust".

"Welcome Mr. Baker for the Food of Albania" is the title of the article of ZERI I POPULLIT, organ of the Socialist Party of Albania. "The Albanians, the article stresses, consider Baker's arrival as mesia's [as received] arrival, as the arrival of a friend from a great state above all to regain the confidence that the world has not forgotten Albania and the Albanians".

The newspaper "BASHKIMI" carries the writing by Kristaq Coka with biographical data for the U.S. secretary of state as well as writing by Vladimir Zoto reflecting the enthusiastic atmosphere amidst which the Albanian people are prepared to welcome the U.S. guest carrying thousands of U.S. flags in their hands.

"The Albanian youth, initiator of genuine democracy and pluralism in Albania, welcomes joyfully and enthusiastically the great American guest" writes the newspaper "ZERI I RINISE" in its editorial. [passage omitted]

'Enthusiastic Rally' Greets Baker

AU2306170791

[Editorial Report] Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian at 1800 GMT on 22 June carries in its regular newscast 25 minutes of reports on the arrival in Tirana of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and a welcome rally held in his honor on Skenderbeg Square.

Timo Luto states: "We are here at Rinas Airport to report on the moment of the arrival of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. For several days now we have been aware of a special feeling of joy and trust in our future, the future of Albania and its people. This feeling has arisen after a long period of wearying isolation, and comes from the goodwill with which the world is surrounding us these days. The people's aspirations for genuine freedom and democracy are now being realized on a smooth and safe road. The Albanian people, a member of the family of European peoples, are being welcomed into the bosom of this family after six centuries. At one time, there was talk about the friendship of the peoples, but it was in fact a friendship of ideologies and of bureaucratic castes. The announcement of pluralism in Albania, for which democratic forces aspired and struggled, is a boundary stone marking the end of 50 years of totalitarian self-isolation and the beginning of a new era of progress and humanism.

"Albania's admission to the CSCE on 19 June was the main step toward Albania's acceptance into the bosom of Europe. This is a historic and decisive moment for the future of our nation. This is a great victory for the forces of democracy. Our people are grateful to the high-level personalities of Europe who supported Albania's admission to the CSCE. We are grateful to the government of the United States for its full support of Albania's application, and we are especially grateful to President George Bush and to Secretary of State James Baker, who arrives in our country on a visit today, to make this support more visible and tangible.

"The report of James Baker's arrival in our country has aroused great interest among the people. The people deserve credit for this visit. For some days the people of the capital city, in a quite normal way and by their own free will, have been preparing to give this high-level U.S. personality as warm a welcome as possible, and to express to him their own respect for his great country, this country that is a symbol of democracy and the defense of freedom. Thousands of U.S. flags have been distributed in Tirana in recent days and you can see them hung on balconies, buildings, in cafes, and on car windshields. In Korce, Fier, Elbasan, Shkoder, Rreshen, Burrel, Puke, Permet, Kavaje, and Kruje, enthusiastic rallies have been held to mark Albania's admission to the CSCE and Baker's visit. William Ryerson, representative of the U.S. Embassy in Tirana, has attended some of these rallies, and has pointed out in his speeches the friendship between our peoples and the United States' support for Albania.

"We have come to Rinas Airport today to wish Mr. Baker welcome on the hospitable soil of Albania. It can be said that this people has been waiting for such a guest for decades. The hope that a visit like this would one day take place has kept them alive and has given them strength to face their difficulties. Thus, Albania finally turns her face toward Europe and the civilized world, and is taking her first steps toward this world, exhausted, but determined and confident that she will attain the heights of European civilization.

"At Rinas Airport today, the Albanian and U.S. flags flutter side by side for the first time. Besides hundreds of local residents, Ylli Bufi, chairman of the Council of Ministers; Kastriot Islami, chairman of the Presidency of the People's Assembly; Muhamet Kapllani, minister of foreign affairs, and others have come to welcome this distinguished U.S. personality and the persons accompanying him. William Ryerson, representative of the U.S. Embassy in Tirana was also present."

Against a background of the sound of jet engines, Luto states: "The aircraft bearing the distinguished U.S. guest

approaches the runway. This visit arouses a special feeling in us, the expectation of something new and welcome. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker descends from the aircraft, accompanied by his wife, Mrs. Suzanne Baker. Ylli Bufi, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Foreign Minister Muhamet Kapllani go up to them, and welcome them to Albanian soil. A group of pioneers give bouquets of fresh flowers to Mr. James Baker and the persons accompanying him."

To the sound of cheers, Luto states: "On the road to Tirana, Mr. James Baker is welcomed by many people who have come to the roadside. Meanwhile, in the capital, the sight is extraordinary. It is very difficult to pass through the enormous crowds of people. About 100,000 people have gathered on Skenderbeg Square, and a sea of U.S. and Albanian flags waves. Many slogans welcome Mr. Baker on his visit. Mr. Baker first pays a short visit to the mosque in the center of Tirana, and emerges to greet the people of the capital at an enthusiastic rally."

A recording of a speech by Prime Minister Ylli Bufi follows, accompanied by incessant cheers and shouts of "Baker, Baker" and "Bush, Bush." Bufi states: "Dear Mr. Baker, brothers and sisters of the capital, compatriots who are present in their hearts and minds at this special celebration, I wish, on your behalf and here before you, to wish Mr. and Mrs. Baker welcome to Albania.

"Better than in any words of mine, this welcome is expressed in our hearts and minds that are filled with joy and love, in the faces illuminated by the light of hope for the future, in the eyes full of love, and in this Albanian reception for an honored guest. You are a high-level representative of the American people, and by making this visit you enter Albanian history. This powerful welcome by the people at this magnificent demonstration is an expression of the love, gratitude, and respect that this ancient and small people conveys through you to the American people and President George Bush.

"It is a special pleasure for me, on behalf of the people of Tirana and the city's Executive Committee, to present Mr. Baker with the freedom of the city.

"Albanian hospitality is something special today, because it also involves the great and justifiable joy of the entire people at the admission of Albania as a full-fledged member into the bosom of the European family. Now, Albania is not only geographically in Europe, but politically, and shortly economically too. Mr. Baker, it is not by accident that your visit today coincides with this historic event for the Albanian people. I feel it is a duty, in the name of this people and the government I lead, to thank the United States and you personally for your great and special contribution to Albania's admission to the CSCE. For the Albanian people and Albanian society, thirsty for democracy and progress, the United States and Europe are the symbols of progress and guarantees for genuine freedom and democracy. Until now, there has not been any opportunity to fulfill the ancient aspirations of the Albanians to be members of the family of civilized and democratic nations in the way that this people, one of the most ancient in the Balkans and Europe, would have wished. The antinational policy of self-isolation, pursued by for a long time by the Stalinist regime in Albania, separated the country from the world. It is not the place to mention today the consequences of this isolation, because this is a day of celebration that marks the end of Albania's self-isolation. Your visit, Mr. Baker, crowns the Albanians' justifiable joy and inaugurates a new era in Albanian-U.S. relations. Dear Mr. Baker, I wish to say to you that these young boys and girls you see before you, these enthusiastic people, are a living force to speed up democratic processes in Albania. These young people, filled with democratic ideals, deserve a better life, a worthy kind of prosperity, and a genuine spiritual and cultural integration of the Albanians, wherever they are. This is the historic task of the government and all the political parties and forces. They will be able to use and build on this historic day. I wish to convey to you the Albanians' joy at having the support of you and President Bush on this road, to overcome our difficult situation, and to cooperate together fruitfully and uninterruptedly. Long live friendship between the Albanian and American peoples."

Luto then describes James Baker taking the rostrum, and expressing his thanks for "the incredible welcome and the incredible demonstration of a yearning for a reawakening, politically, spiritually, and economically." A recording of Baker's speech is broadcast in English, with an Albanian translation provided by the interpreter in Skenderbeg Square. Every phrase of the speech is followed by cheers. At the point when Baker says "I have not come here today, my friends, to instruct you on the virtues of freedom or democracy, because you know yourselves how inhuman are the ways of totalitarianism," the crowd cheers and shouts "Enver—Hitler."

Prime Minister Receives Baker

AU2206194291 Tirana ATA in English 1803 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Tirana, June 22 (ATA)—On June 22, the Prime Minister Ylli Bufi received at the seat of the Council of Ministers the secretary of the U.S. State Department, James Baker.

The Premier Bufi, after wishing him welcome once again, said to the Secretary of State James Baker that "I consider your visit as a backing to Albania and the government of the country's stability in these historical moments". He also thanked Mister James Baker for his contribution and of the American Government to Albania's admission to the CSCE.

On his part the secretary of the State Department, James Baker said that never in my life have I seen such a welcome as in Tirana, and I am deeply moved by this. I thank you, he said to the Albanian premier, the government and people of Albania for the strength, vitality and deep feelings they manifested in this reception.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers, Ylli Bufi, spoke on Albania's transition from a country with a totalitarian system to a democratic country, which observes the human

rights, from a country with a centralized economy to a country with a market economy, adding that, the duty of the government he heads is to materialize the new political solution of the various political forces, a solution which enjoys the support of the big democracies, the USA included. Our most important task, he said, is to overcome the crisis of confidence, which has its roots both in the failures of the past and in the insecurity for the future. Our belief that this crisis will be surmounted is based first of all on the fact that the people believe in the democracy and in the government of the country's stability, and [words indistinct] plane we enjoy support from all the main factors which today play a role in the international life.

The secretary of state, Mister James Baker, stated that the delegation he heads is seeing with its own eyes very great changes, the extraordinary rallys organized today in Tirana, the welcome the people extended to it all over the street are the best testimony to this. At the same time our bilateral relations are positively carried ahead.

Mister Baker dwelt on his department's opinion regarding the [words indistinct] Albania. He said that the process of transition to a democratic society with a legal state is carried or being carried out in many Eastern countries. The political and legislative reform in Albania should include by all means, he said, the complete release of the political prisoners, the approval of the laws which guarantee the juridical state, the observation of human rights and those of the national minorities, the freedom to elections, the equal use of the official mass media, the elimination of the structures of political repression, the avoidance of the probable use of the Army as a political instrument.

The Albanian premier ensured [as received] the senior American guest that the government of the country's stability is seriously engaged in the above [word indistinct] directions: in preparing the general amnesty, in the complete restructuring of the national security organs into institutions which observe human rights etc.

Further on Ylli Bufi and James Baker dwelt upon economic problems: We understand the very difficult crisis your economy is undergoing, the U.S. secretary of state said. As a former minister of finances in the USA, I might suggest, taking into account also the experience of many Eastern countries, that the only way out of this situation is to adopt drastic measures, the so called shock therapy. Otherwise the transitional period towards market economy threatens to be excessively prolonged.

It is our duty to associate the political confidence we built up towards the Albanian Government—to which testified our support for Albania's admission to the CSCE and my visit to Tirana, with economic aid. To this end the American Government first of all envisages to send to Albania food reserves, which were deployed during the Persian Gulf war in this region. These aids include a quantity of powder milk worth 3 million dollars to arrive very soon, beans and rice worth 1 million dollars, various medicaments worth 1 million dollars. Adding to these also the aids for the Albanian Red Cross, the total quantity on the immediate aid amounts to 6 million dollars. This humanitarian aid is considered by us just as a beginning. Meanwhile the [word indistinct] government offers specialization of Albanian experts and sending of American experts to Albania for legal and economic aspects, the granting of the scholarships for the Albanian students and scholars, the dispatch of texts for various specialties, visits by the Albanian parliamentarians and newsmen to the USA etc.

It will be easier for the USA to help your country economically when the latter adheres to the various international financial organisms as the group of 24, IMF and the World Bank. We fully support Albania's admission to these organisms, he said.

Evaluating the U.S. Government's commitment, the premier Ylli Bufi expressed the desire of the Albanian Government that the economic aids from the USA and [word indistinct] Western Europe come as quickly as possible, considering this as a basic element for the success of our economic reform.

Both parties discussed at length on detailed problems of Albania's relations with the international financial organisms.

Present at the meeting were the deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers Gramoz Pashko and Zydi Pepa and the minister of foreign affairs, Muhamet Kapllani.

The head of the U.S. delegation for the opening of the U.S. Embassy in our country, William Rayson was also present.

Ramiz Alia Receives Baker

AU2206194491 Tirana ATA in English 1820 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Tirana, June 22 (ATA)—On June 22 a [word indistinct] the President of the Republic of Albania Ramiz Alia received at the Palace of Brigades the Secretary of the U.S. State Department, James Baker.

Ramiz Alia, greeted Baker warmly and voiced his special pleasure over meeting him. Your coming to Albania, he said to the distinguished representative of the American people, is an historical moment. As you yourself saw all the Albanian people welcome you. On my behalf and of the Albanian people I wish you welcome. You come to Albania, President Ramiz Alia said, following two marked events: the establishment of the diplomatic relations between Albania and the USA and our country's admission to the CSCE. In both these important events you and the President Bush have rendered a powerful support and backing to Albania.

After thanking President Ramiz Alia for his considerations, Mister James Baker said that I am very pleased for the visit and the warm and incredible welcome extended to me and my colleagues by the Albanian people.

On this occasion, he said, allow me to convey the greetings of President Bush for you and the Albanian people.

I, Baker said further on, had a fruitful meeting with the Albanian premier and other government members. We had the occasion to examine the details of your program about the economic and political reform and I welcome talks with you.

President Ramiz Alia briefed Mister Baker on the democratic processes taking place in our country. He said that radical democratic transformations are being carried out in Albania. Our effort has been and is that all these democratic processes be carried out with maturity, without excesses. Naturally, alongside the achievements, there is still much to be done, especially in the field of human rights, in passing onto the market economy etc. Certainly there are difficulties, but we are not discouraged. We are determined to march on this road, because this is in the interest of our people. And marching in this way, we are confident that we shall find the alround support and backing of the USA, as well as of the international community, so as to overcome hardships and make way for further democratic developments.

On his part, Mister Baker addressed to President Ramiz Alia—Allow me to say that I agree with all what you said and hail the democratic developments in Albania and its admission to the CSCE. I understand the difficulties of passing from one system to another one, but I maintain that the steps should be quicker. I see clearly that there are results regarding the promotion of political freedoms, religious freedoms, of economic ones etc. We wish to help you in this difficult road to overcome hardships, because I believe in the continuity of your reforms.

I, Mister Baker said, will tell President Bush about this incredible welcome extended to me in Albania and which our cameramen have filmed.

President Ramiz Alia said we will march on this road and thank you for your commitment to help Albania. We wish the development of the relations with the USA in every field. In the USA there is a big Albanian community and they will surely help Albania develop and progress. During this meeting views were exchanged also on problems of the international situation, on the situation in Yugoslavia and that [word indistinct] the Albanians in Kosovo and other territories in Yugoslavia.

President Ramiz Alia, asked Mister Baker [to] convey cordial greetings to President Bush. I have heard, he said, that President Bush will soon go to Greece .

On this occasion I have the satisfaction to invite him for a visit to Albania.

Replying to this invitation Mr. Baker said that he will brief President Bush for the extraordinary reception extended to him in Albania and tell him how near Albania and Greece are.

Attending the reception was the Minister of Foreign Affairs Muhamet Kapllani.

Present was also the head of the U.S. delegation for the opening of the U.S. Embassy in our country William Ryerson.

Prior to the meeting with Mr. Baker, President Ramiz Alia received for few moments a group of foreign journalists, mainly American and Albanians. Bidding them welcome to Albania, the President said that Baker's visit is a major event for the Albanian people. He is the first great American personality who comes to Albania and enjoys priority [as received]. It is the first time in the whole history of Albania that a U.S. secretary of state comes here. This, he said, is of great importance, because it follows two major events: the establishment of diplomatic relations with the USA and Albania's membership to the CSCE.

This belongs to the external aspect. In the internal aspect, the president continued, it is important because Mr. Baker comes here at a time when democratic developments, radical changes in the political, economic and social fields are taking place. Therefore our people [word indistinct] this visit with great pleasure. And here I mean you, the journalists, too, who are here for the first time.

Regarding the question of a journalist whether it is true that Mr. Baker comes to Albania with the promise for aid to the tune of 6 million dollars on the part of the USA, President Ramiz Alia said I have not met with Baker yet, so I do not know it. [Word indistinct] that the USA will surely help Albania in its economic and democratic development etc. There is a considerable Albanian community in the USA. I am sure that this community is interested in Albania's development and progress of their homeland. In this framework I believe that the USA will be willing to help Albania.

To the question that once Albania has called the USA an imperialist country and now a democratic country, the president responded that there have been many nominations before to qualify a country or another. There was the cold war, the military blocs and opposite economic communities and on this basis various labels have existed. I am of the opinion that the USA have been and are a democratic country, that pushes ahead democracy and backs up the democratic development of each country. In this framework I think that the USA will back up the democratic transformations in Albania.

With regard to the question whether there might be a step backwards on the initiated road, President Ramiz Alia, responded no. Albania's growth on this road and the whole process of the country's democratization, he stressed is irreversible, because this is an objective demand of the country's development. It is not a subjective matter whether I or some one else wishes it. Hence, it is a necessity of the growth and progress of our country, people and economy. Mr. Baker's visit will influence on the further promotion of democracy in our country and consequently on the irreversible march forward of these processes.

Bufi Addresses Rally

LD2206132791 Tirana ATA in English 1216 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Address by Prime Minister Ylli Bufi at a rally welcoming U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's arrival on Tirana's Scanderbeg Square on 22 June; "Address of Comrade Ylli Bufi"—ATA headline]

[Text] [No dateline as received] Respected Mr. Baker, sisters and brothers of the capital, compatriots who are heart and sole present in this special holiday. On your behalf I want to wish once again Mr. Baker and Mrs. Baker welcome in Albania. More than through my words, this joy is expressed in our minds and hearts filled with confidence and generosity, in our faces shining with today with the light of hope for the future, in the eyes full of Albanian affection and generosity for the esteemed guest. Welcome in Albania Mr. Baker. You are the senior representative of the American people, who upon this visit go down into the history of Albania. This ardent wish of the people in this grand rally is the message of friendship, gratitude and respect this ancient and small people sends through you to the American people and President George Bush. On this occasion it is a special pleasure for me on behalf of the people of Tirana and the executive committee of Tirana, to declare Mr. Baker honourable citizen of Tirana. Albanian generosity is today completely special because it is fraught with great and legitimate joy of the whole people over Albania's adherence to the fold of European family. Now Albania is no longer merely part of Europe, but it is also is present in its political life and soon in the economic one as well.

ATA Reports Arrival, Activities

AU2206135291 Tirana ATA in English 1149 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] James Baker, Secretary of the U.S. State Department together with his wife, Suzanne Baker arrived in our country today.

Present to welcome them at the airport were Kastriot Islami, chairman of the Presidency of the People's Assembly, Ylli Bufi, chairman of the Council of Ministers, Gramoz Pashko, vice- chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of economy, Muhamet Kapllani, minister for foreign affairs, etc. Present was also representative of the U.S. State Department for the opening of the U.S. Embassy in Tirana, William Ryerson .

Immediately after arriving at the Rinas airport, the U.S. secretary of state, James Baker and the delegation accompanying him left for Tirana. On the route to the capital, thousands of peasants and citizens of Vora lined up on both sides of the street to greet him. At the entry of Tirana city the honoured guests were greeted by thousands of citizens lined up on both sides of the street. They hailed the U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and those escorting him by waving national flags of both countries and applauding and acclaiming for the ancient friendship between our two peoples.

I on this occasion a grand rally was held in the "Skanderbeg" square with scores of thousands of people participating. A poster of the statue of freedom [liberty], the U.S. flag and the inscription "welcome" was placed on the facade of the palace of culture, while on the rostrum set up before the statue of the national hero Skanderbeg, national flags of Albania and the United States of America fluttered. First he visited the Tirana mosque. At 10:00 the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Albania, Ylli Bufi, the chairman of the Presidency of the People's Assembly, Kastriot Islami, the vice-premier and minister of economy, Gramoz Pashko, the foreign minister, Muhamet Kapllani, representatives of the political parties and the U.S. delegation headed by James Baker mounted the rostrum. The people present in the square burst out with stormy applause and acclamations. The floor was taken by Premier Ylli Bufi, who greeted and bid welcome to Albania to the U.S. Secretary of State Department, Mr. James Baker.

ATA Reports on Departure

AU2206194691 Tirana ATA in English 1848 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Tirana, June 22 (ATA) —The U.S. secretary of state, Mr. James Baker wound up successfully his one day visit to Albania and left our country today.

Present to see off the first high ranking representative of the American people at the Rinas Airport was the Chairman of the Council of Ministers Ylli Bufi, the Chairman of the Presidency of the People's Assembly Kastriot Islami, the vice-chairman of the council of ministers and minister of economy, Gramoz Pashko, the minister of foreign affairs, Muhamet Kapllani, government members, deputies of the People's Assembly etc.

Present were also the chairman of the steering committee of Socialist Party of Albania, Fatos Nano, the chairman of the steering committee of the Democratic Party of Albania, Sali Berisha, representatives of the Omonia organisation, etc.

Present was also the chairman of the U.S. delegation for the opening of the U.S. Embassy in Tirana, William Ryerson.

Present were also a number of local and foreign journalists.

Prior to his departure, Mr. James Baker gave the following interview to the TV journalist: "First of all I want to express my thanks for the Albanian people, their very heartfelt and incredible reception extended to me in the square. I understand these not as personal sentiments, but as a manifestation and symbol of the Albanian people for freedom and democracy. We endorse all of them. We back up the Albanian Government and people. We render our support for other political endeavours and economic reforms. We hope that the Albanian people will push ahead as the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe."

Zhelev Speaks at SDS National Conference

AU2206192391 Sofia BTA in English 1815 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Iva Toncheva and Mariya Velkovska report]

[Text] Sofia, June 22 (BTA)—The Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) should run in the elections on a single blue voting paper, with positive propaganda. It should conduct its election campaign in a civilized manner, President Zhelyu Zhelev said today at the SDS National Conference.

Asked by a BTA reporter why he was at the conference, Dr. Zhelev said "I am part of the SDS." Dr. Zhelev was leader of the opposition until last August when he was elected president. "I will not return to the position of SDS leader," he told BTA in connection with the idea suggested by Mr. Vladimir Kostov of Radio Free Europe and promoted by the Bulgarian press that Dr. Zhelev should return to the SDS to consolidate its unity. The SDS has been rent by grave differences for the last few months.

The delegates to the conference greeted Dr. Zhelev enthusiastically. His speech was followed by a standing ovation.

In his speech Dr. Zhelev said that the opposition must win the new elections "because this will determine all important things in Bulgarian political life, including the ultimate change in the attitude of Europe and the world towards Bulgaria."

According to the president the new elections will be held in near future, "whatever happens." He said they will be held in September at the latest. The president confirmed the view he expressed a few weeks ago in parliament: On July 17 the Grand National Assembly must dissolve itself, regardless of whether it has passed the constitution.

President Zhelev listed several conditions for the SDS electoral victory: unity of the united democratic opposition, unity of the opposition Union of Democratic Forces, unity within the diversity of structures and ideological platforms in the SDS.

The problem of SDS unity was discussed vehemently at the national conference which started this morning. The unity of the SDS was in danger as the rift between supporters of the SDS Nationwide Movement and those of the existing coalition grew to excess during the last few months. The Group of 39—MP's of the SDS who boycotted parliament on May 14 and favour the SDS Nationwide Movement—stretched out a hand of reconciliation three days ago. The Group of 39 issued a declaration that the SDS should run in the new elections on a single ticket and that the parties in the union should retain their organizational and ideological independence.

The same idea was promoted today ov President Zhelev, former leader of the opposition, Finance Minister Ivan Kostov, and many delegates from the provinces. It was also supported by Dr. Petur Dertliev, chairman of the Social Democratic Party, and Mr. Milan Drenchev, leader of the Nikola Petkov Agrarian Party. Before the conference there was talk that their two parties might leave the SDS if they were displeased with the decisions of the conference.

The radicals and the moderates made it clear today that they are inclined to a compromise in the name of the electoral victory of the SDS.

Today's speeches bear promise of a solution to the knotty problems of party quotas in the tickets and the way of nominating candidates. The general opinion is that there should be no quotas and candidates should be nominated from below, i.e. in a democratic way.

According to a blitz survey among delegates to the conference, 56 per cent of them believe the SDS should develop as a nationwide movement and it should give up partisan interests and quotas at the elections. Only 19.3 per cent of delegates favour the coalition.

Dr. Petur Dertliev, leader of the Social Democratic Party, said that quotas are not the major issue. Mr. Milan Drenchev, leader of the Nikola Petkov Agrarian Party, said that "quotas don't matter but the political clout of the parties in the SDS should be taken into consideration." Both Dr. Dertliev and Mr. Drenchev believe that the SDS should retain its unity until the elections.

SDS Address to Electorate Reported

AU2306154791 Sofia BTA in English 1508 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 23 (BTA)—The opposition Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) states in an address to the electorate that it is ready to take Bulgaria out of the crisis within a reasonable time span. The SDS does not promise prosperity, as the Bulgarian Socialist Party did to win last year's elections, the SDS wants "enterprising and capable people to earn enough of their labour."

The address was approved yesterday at the SDS National Conference and contains the basics of its election platform. The entire address is positive in purport. The key sentence according to observers is: "Bulgaria should become a normal state." According to the SDS Bulgaria is facing elections which will decide "whether Bulgaria will become a normal state or will remain Europe's poor relation."

The SDS states that it is ready to rule alongside other democratic parties which genuinely wish to eliminate communist structures. The SDS believes that a stable parliamentary majority will enable it to change the parasitic economic structures and to form a strong government.

The opposition union states it will defend human rights irrespective of religion and ethnicity. Ethnic controversy can be overcome through economic and political freedom.

The pre-election address states that the SDS will support and strengthen the spiritual link of all Bulgarians, including those abroad, with their native land.

The SDS, which launched its election campaign three weeks ago, will conduct it in an entirely positive way. Mr. Filip Dimitrov, SDS leader and chief of its Election Club, said on the radio today that he worries about the mimicry of the Socialist (ex-Communist) Party's slogans and the discrepancy between its words and deeds.

Views Unity Problems

AU2106202891 Sofia BTA in English 1948 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Iva Toncheva report]

[Text] Sofia, June 21 (BTA)—An important two-day conference of the opposition Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] opens tomorrow. It is convened to clarify the election concept of the SDS and adopt a decision on the structure of the opposition coalition which comprises seventeen parties and movements. But the key problem the opposition has got to solve is that of its unity. The opposition should decide whether it will remain a coalition of parties or will turn into a nation-wide movement, or some compromise solution between these two should be sought.

The contradictions within the SDS have intensified in the last few months after about fifty MP's of the SDS boycotted parliament. Their group supports the idea that the SDS should become a nation-wide movement. The day before yesterday they stated in a declaration that the SDS should run in the forthcoming elections with a single list. The radicals have obviously taken a compromise stand on the matter—they would not mind if the parties in the SDS preserve their independence—both ideologically and organizationally. But they are against any party quotas in nominating the election candidates.

Judging by leaders' statements made these days, the influential Bulgarian Social Democratic Party, a member of the opposition, will not reconcile itself with it. The day before yesterday BSDP functionary Petur Kornazhev unambiguously stated that his party would make its own decision if the outcome of the conference proved to be unsatisfactory, i.e., "if the advocates of turning the SDS into a movement gain the upper hand" at the conference. He let it be understood that the BSDP would seek another coalition in this case. No doubt the question is about collaboration with another large party in the SDS—the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party, and probably some other organizations within the coalition.

The Green Party declared itself to be for the clear emergence of three blocs in the SDS: the SDS—Movement, SDS—Left-Wing (the Social Democrats and the Nikola Petkov Agrarians) and a liberal bloc comprising the Greens, the Ecoglasnost Movement and the Federation of Democracy Clubs.

Earlier this week SDS Chairman Filip Dimitrov told journalists he hoped a compromise would be found at the conference. Asked what its price would be, he said:, "The SDS's victory in the elections."

Zhelev Discusses Foreign Policy Priorities

AU2306192091 Sofia BTA in English 1904 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 23 (BTA)—The new Bulgaro-Soviet Treaty, which is being discussed by experts, will not contain military clauses that may endanger Bulgaria's sovereignty, President Zhelyu Zhelev said on television this evening in a half-an-hour interview on Bulgaria's foreign-policy priorities.

Bulgaria will probably also sign treaties with individual republics: Russia and others. Bulgaria has an interest in maintaining direct contacts with them, particularly in the economic sphere, Dr. Zhelev said. According to him the Soviet Union will become a confederation of equal sovereign states with the signing of the new union treaty.

President Zhelev described Mr. Yeltsin's election to Russia's presidency as an extremely important event which gives a hope that "conservative forces will no longer be able to block democratic processes." "Significantly, Mr. Yeltsin said in Washington that the Marxist experiment in Russia is over. These words show that communism is going away from Russia, the home of communism," Dr. Zhelev said. He hopes that Bulgaria will be the second country after the United States to be visited by Mr. Yeltsin.

"We are not opposing our relations with Israel to relations with the Arab countries, we will never allow such an opposition, a discrimination in these relations," Bulgaria's president said, asked whether improvement in Bulgaro-Israeli relations will cause jealousy in the Arab world. Talks are being held on the establishment of diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia, there are active contacts with the United Arab Emirates. Bulgaria's foreign minister will visit Egypt in near future.

President Zhelev emphasized that this is the first time small countries have had the chance to ensure guarantees for security and national sovereignty on the basis of regional horizontal and international military and political structures.

Popov on Interest Rate, Talks With Gorbachev

AU2106160291 Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian No. 24 17 Jun 91 p 4

["Part of shorthand transcript of collective interview with Prime Minister Dimitur Popov" by unidentified reporters; place and date not given: "Prime Minister Dimitur Popov on Recovery After 50 Years of Degeneration"]

[Excerpts] [POGLED] Will there be something to eat during the coming winter?

[Popov] We will have something to eat if we work. There is still time for us to start working properly. Even now we have food that we can export. When I was in Varna Oblast, I found out that the trading organizations want to export 450 tons of olive oil. Why? It is because the trade organizations in the market do not want it. As soon as the goods reach the stores, they will have to pay interest. They do not want to trade, and they do not know how to do business. May I reveal a state "secret" to you? Bulgarian enterprises have about 1.5 billion leva in Bulgarian banks now, at this very moment. They are not utilizing this money—they either do not know how to use it, or they are doing this deliberately.

[POGLED] Is our interest rate high in comparison with other countries that are more or less in the same situation?

[Popov] Our interest rate is among the lower ones. The interest rate converts money into a commodity and returns money to the bank. We have about 25 billion leva which are outside the banks and exert immense pressure on the market. However, the interest rate in commerce is 45 percent only if it is calculated in the most elementary manner. For example, if you take 100 leva in credit on 1 January, you will have to pay back 145 leva on 31 December. However, if you circulate this amount 10 times, the interest rate works out at 4.5 percent.

[POGLED] We are a country in which nothing is in order, neither our trade, transport, nor anything else. How can you pay back credits when, for example, there is no gasoline. The people have no money to get started.

[Popov] We have superb enterprises—I can take you to visit them to see for yourselves—that are working ideally under this system, and for them the current interest rate is low. Interest represents the price of money. The high interest rate reduces inflation. Understand this, the interest rate policy is the mother of success. Money must have a price. Money is a commodity. Anyone who wants to have this commodity must be able to work with money. Anyone who cannot work with money should not take a loan.

[POGLED] How will someone who wants to buy a tractor, for example, pay such a high interest rate? Will he earn enough money to pay back the loan?

[Popov] The interest rate should not be the same in agriculture because the money circulates only once. You sow once and thresh the crop once. However, in trade you can circulate the money 10 or 20 times a year. You are right that the interest rate in agriculture should not be the same. We should have agricultural banks that offer long-term credits at low interest. They exist throughout the world, and they used to exist in Bulgaria. I remember the Bulgarian popular banks and the Bulgarian Agrarian Cooperative Bank. They provided credits for agriculture, and the system worked very well until the idea of collectivizing agriculture appeared.

[POGLED] What if a high interest rate is imposed on someone who starts a business right now?

[Popov] Such a person should receive other allowances, for example, in the form of reduced taxes. Companies with a certain amount of capital should be exempted from taxes or pay less taxes for three to five years. In the case of agriculture, we decided that no tax is to be paid. Recently, the Council of Ministers adopted a new decision, in principle, namely to exempt from tax all companies in settlements with populations of less than 1,000.

It is impossible in four or five months for us to correct everything that has accumulated over almost 50 years. If anyone can do this, I invite him to try. I will be the first to make way for him. It is very difficult. For example, what has become of the Bulgarian cooperative? They nationalized it, deformed it, and turned it into an economic-political formation. It is no longer a cooperative. We support the pure cooperative. We are not opposed to the labor cooperative farm. Quite the contrary; let it be, but it should be a cooperative of owners, not of functionaries using other people's land. Allowances should indeed be provided, but not in the form of interest rates. Money must always have its own value.

[POGLED] Did the IMF demand this interest rate and oblige us to impose it?

[Popov] The IMF issues recommendations, not orders. It did not oblige us to impose this interest rate. We can set the interest rate at 25 percent, but what will we gain from this? [passage omitted]

[POGLED] How many years will it take to complete the privatization?

[Popov] It may last from one to 30 years. This is a process. However, we will complete the so-called small privatization within about two years. This will cover about 25 percent of the enterprises and facilities. The procedure for valuing the enterprises is very complex.

[POGLED] Will there be any more newspapers?

[Popov] When have we had more newspapers in Bulgaria than now?

[POGLED] What about taxes? Why, for example, did you exempt the Motorists Union from taxes, but not the Bulgarian Journalists Union?

[Popov] The motorists pay more taxes; we collect them in other ways, and have not granted them privileges. The decision was not made because Popov is a motorist, as I read today in FAKS.

[POGLED] Your meeting with Gorbachev was not given priority coverage on Bulgarian Television. Did this annoy you?

[Popov] Why should I be annoyed? I do not even know when this information was reported. In the Soviet Union the news item was reported first in three newscasts, while the 2.5-hour-long talks between Mr. Gorbachev and the PRC party general secretary were transmitted later. It is all a question of assessment. I was not flattered by this. My conversation with Gorbachev was something exceptional. He is a very interesting man to talk with. The talks were attended by Valentin Pavlov, the Soviet prime minister. Here I can tell you a secret. Before starting the talks with Gorbachev, I asked Mr. Pavlov to talk with me privately. He talked with me for about 40 minutes. We found a realistic approach that enabled us later to conclude a matter in two hours that would otherwise have taken two weeks. It is a real pleasure to talk with Gorbachev.

[POGLED] Was this the first time you met him?

[Popov] Yes.

[POGLED] What was the content of President Zhelev's message to Gorbachev?

[Popov] It was a goodwill message, expressing respect and the desire of both sides to maintain their relations. In general, it was an intelligently- written message, in the spirit of mutual benefit, a good letter. I handed it over, and extended greetings from President Zhelev, to which Mr. Gorbachev reciprocated....

[POGLED] Will we import cars?

[Popov] The import of cars has become impossible because, first, we have no foreign currency and, second, no one can afford to buy cars at this price. The price can only be the value of the cars plus, in dollar terms, excise duty, import duty and tax. We have reached an agreement with the Soviet Union under which we will not settle our accounts in freely convertible currency, but on a foreign exchange clearing basis, that is, goods in return for goods, valued at world market prices. This was not possible previously, but it is now. We must produce high-value goods with a high level of labor and intellectual content. [passage omitted]

Poll Reflects Optimism for Economic Recovery

AU2206195191 Sofia BTA in English 1925 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 22 (BTA)—61 per cent of Bulgarians believe that within five years Bulgaria's economic condition will improve. 65 per cent believe they can manage on their own, unaided by the state. These are data from the latest sociological survey of Bulgaria's equivalent to Gallup, the National Public Opinion Centre.

44 per cent of Bulgarians believe that Bulgaria can cope with the crisis without external aid, while 41 per cent do not think so.

22 per cent of respondents believe they will achieve a satisfactory living standard within three to five years. 17 per cent—a large section according to pollsters—have answered they will never achieve it.

62 per cent of respondents prefer high prices and well-stocked shops in Bulgaria. This explains the large support for Mr. Dimitur Popov's government: 55 per cent of Bulgarians find the actions it takes necessary and correct. 24 per cent of Bulgarians disapprove of them.

27 per cent of respondents point out that one of the government's tasks is to oust Communists from power. 39 per cent believe the government should deal with the fair distribution of incomes.

Yonchev Says SS-23 Missiles Vital for Security

AU1806125591 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 14 Jun 91 p 1

[DUMA report: "SS-23 Missiles Are Necessary for National Security"]

[Text] Possessing SS-23 missiles, or any other kind of weapon, is necessary for national security and is Bulgaria's right. NATO does not view Bulgaria as a source of aggression or as a threat to the countries of NATO. Dimitur Yonchev said this when he put the question of Bulgaria's national security and SS-23 missiles to Manfred Woerner, at talks between the NATO secretary general and legislative groups on 13 June.

I want to stress Mr. Woerner's words since I believe that what was said about the SS-23 missiles affects our concept of national security—the right to decide ourselves by what means and weapons our sovereignty will be defended, and in addition, that Bulgaria represents no real danger to its neighbors.

Dimitur Yonchev pointed out that the request to dismantle the missiles is quite a serious encroachment on our eventual independence because it makes us vulnerable.

The SS-23 missiles are modern conventional weapons with cassette [kasetuchni] warheads, which are used for strikes from the air against populated areas prior to the beginning of active combat. Dimitur Yonchev stressed that the missiles are a mandatory element of any defense strategy.

Havel Grants Weekly 'Lany' Interview

LD2306152391 Prague Ceskoslovensky Rozhlas Radio Network in Czech 1215 GMT 23 Jun 91

["Conversations at Lany": Interview with President Vaclav Havel by Jiri Vejvoda at Havel's Prague Castle office on 21 June—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Vejvoda] Mr. President, is it possible to interpret the results of the Kromeriz talks as the completion of one constitutional phase which you opened? If so, did you plan this completion. Or was it an unexpected one brought about by the circumstances of the meeting?

[Havel] It is true that I started that series of talks about the new constitution, about our new constitutions. I think that the preliminary political talks for which I created the space culminated in the last meeting in Kromeriz. [passage omitted]

The solution at which we arrived considers views of all the participants in the talks—the Czech ones and the Slovak ones—as much as possible, and, at the same time, it aims at preserving and rebuilding our common federative state. If the representative bodies do not take this path, then I am afraid that the only other alternative left is a gradual parting of our two republics, our two nations. This is not the wish of the majority of our citizens and political parties. In fact, only the Slovak National Party directly opposed the idea of a common federative state. The problem was that some of our Slovak friends or partners attempted to loose our federative union as much as possible, as if it were possible to dissolve the existing not too good federation just for a little while, establish two partner subjects in their sovereignty, and, subsequently, to link them again. This course of action is unacceptable for the majority of the Czech political parties because in this way the legal continuity of our common state would be destroyed. It would be a very dangerous course of action which could lead to the disintegration of our state, even without the partners intending to do so. The majority of Czech parties do not believe in the longevity and good prospects of such very loose confederation of unions. A confederation is more likely just a preparatory phase for a federation or a preparatory phase for a split. It is not a firm union, and rather than live for several years in some kind of a temporary state, which would at the end lead to a split of the state anyway, then it is really more reasonable to part our ways immediately. [passage omitted]

As far as this first and only case is concerned—i.e., as far as the adoption of the constitutions is concerned—the principle would apply that the Federal constitution would come into force only after being ratified by the national Councils. I firmly believe that the Kromeriz talks provided the basis for a further course of action and that the National Councils will really conclude such a treaty and that the Federal Assembly will draft the constitution. [passage omitted]

Political talks have ended for the time being; the issues will be discussed by the National Councils, the legislatures. In case the process begins to lag behind, conflicts begin to emerge, and something goes wrong, that some kind of a crisis appears, then we would meet in a similar way and hold talks again.

[Vejvoda] Mr. President, what would happen if, at the end of the day, either of the National Councils failed to ratify the Federal constitution? Would it mean the breakup of the state? Or, somewhat paradoxically, would the current constitution basically drawn up under the Communist regime still apply?

[Havel] First, let us say what ratification is. It means either yes or no. It is not a process of commenting yes but or submitting additional motions, amendment motions, improvement motions. Every legislative aspect must be drawn up and finalized beforehand, before it is discussed in the Federal legislature, the national councils, and all three governments, who will give their view on it. If that happens, it is unlikely that one of the National Councils will say no. Nonetheless, we must admit, at least theoretically, the possibility that one of the National Councils will fail to ratify the new constitution. This is something we also must think about, and, in my view, the final provision ought to state clearly what will happen in such an event. My opinion is that, in such an event, the Republic whose National Council says no ought to hold a referendum on the constitution which would have the final say. Naturally, if the new constitution does not take effect, then the old one is still valid. That is clear because one constitution or other must apply.

[Vejvoda] Amid so many facts on this matter, allow me to ask a question rather more concerned with emotions on behalf of many listeners who have been flooding us—and, therefore, you, Mr. President—with questions on all sorts of subjects in the last few weeks. What they ask is this: When you say I had basically good feelings about these or those talks on the constitutions, what do your innermost feelings actually tell you?

[Havel] You see, I am sometimes erroneously suspected of wanting to preserve the federation at all costs. That is not true. I believe that our nations have the right to have what they want. My personal feeling is that it is advantageous for them to live in a federative state, and if there were a referendum, I would vote for a federation. In the spirit of my oath—after all, I swore on the Federal Constitution that I would honor and uphold it—I am duty bound to uphold the integrity of the state and ensure the constitutionality of all its processes no matter how revolutionary, dramatic, and new they may be. Nonetheless, this does not mean that I wish to impose my will on our nations. The decision is theirs, and I will respect that decision. I am not someone who trembles for the destiny of the federation. I am someone who supports the federation, but, at the same time, someone who respects the will of the people. It is no coincidence that more than six months ago it was I who proposed a

constitutional law on a referendum. Why did I propose it? Solely and only because, with due respect for the legislatures and the legislative system, I believe that the possible division of the state into two should not be solely in the hands of the legislature. It should be in the hands of all the people.

[Vejvoda] These remarks bring to mind your response to one of the Slovak deputies who, I believe, asked you where you are taking our nations. Your reply was to the effect that this was not your role, and that wherever it was, it was the nations that would take themselves there through their own ability. This takes me back to your two visits to the Czech and Slovak National Councils, and I would like to know what the deputies there asked you, and what you found most interesting about those visits.

[Havel] Yes, those were my first visits to the plenary sessions of the two national councils since the elections. They took place in quick succession and in both cases we held a two-hour debate where I gave a short improvised opening address about our foreign policy, and then a long series of questions and answers followed in both legislatures.

In the Czech National Council about two-thirds of the questions dealt with various aspects of foreign policy, and in the Slovak National Council, on the other hand, most of them were about our internal political situation, the constitutional set-up, and the future of our state. In both debates they pullled no punches with their questions—they were sharp and frank, and I tried to answer them as best I could, and I think things turned out well on the whole.

I have a good impression of the visits. I must smile as I say that because you asked me a moment ago what it means when I say that I have a good impression of something; but I do, indeed, have a good impression. I thought it would be worse, I had feared that there would be some sniping, a shouting match, or something similar but there was nothing of the sort even though many deputies from the Slovak National Party and those who do not share my views on economic reform, social policy, and the constitutional set-up spoke in the Slovak National Council. Those deputies' questions were factual and polite. Sometimes, disputes or conflicts appear to be worse at a distance than closeup.

When I read certain articles about Czechoslovakia in the foreign press, I get the feeling that the state is in danger of collapsing any day now, yet I live here and I see that this is not the case. Similarly, when I am in Slovakia the situation does not appear to me as serious or dramatic as it may seem from a distance in Prague. To tell the truth, face to face with the Slovak National Counci deputies and even with demonstrators shouting; enough of Havel, I feel the situation is better than it may appear from afar. That is all the more reason for me to visit Slovakia more often. [passage omitted]

[Vejvoda] The meeting of European foreign ministers took place this week in Berlin, the new capital city of the reunited Germany. What is your comment on this fact? What are the various implications of this for Europe and, perhaps, for us, too?

[Havel] I must admit that I am very pleased that this was the decision reached. First, I think that for centuries Berlin was the natural center of Germany. The shift of its capital city west to Bonn, a relatively small city, was, to some extent, imposed by the division of postwar Germany. The capital city of Germany was basically driven out of Berlin, and now it is returning there. That means that things are, in fact, returning where they belong. I think this is a good thing and a good thing for us in Czechoslovakia, too. If we look at the map, we can see that Prague lies on the Berlin-Vienna axis, and we are now, therefore, on a sort of fundamental European line. Prague also lies on the Stockholm-Rome axis. This is significant for the future of Prague as a city but also for the future of the whole of our federation because it, naturally, has geopolitical implications. Germany is once again becoming a Central European country, so it is, therefore, all the more important to put our relations with Germany on a new and truly open and friendly footing.

[Vejvoda] Mr. President, I would like to return once more today to piles of your fan mail received by us in radio. Older citizens—who are, perhaps, your greatest and most selfless fans—are alarmed by your ideas about apologizing for expulsion of the Germans and by a treaty between us and Germany which will be concluded soon.

[Havel] As far as the people who lived through World War II, the Protectorate, and Nazism are concerned, I do understand their alarm and fears. I do understand it fully, and I respect it.

Nevertheless, I would like to let them know, in this way, that their fear is groundless. We will not give parts of our land to the Germans; we will not return property to them; the restitution process will not apply to them, and, thus, people living in the border areas do not need to fear that somebody will come to drive them away from their homes. This is not the issue. What matters is to base our relations on mutual trust, give things their correct names, consider the Munich agreement, World War II, the occupation of Czechoslovakia, our ways of coping with the situation after the war. The expulsion was simply a great mistake for which the blame should be born not only by Czechoslovakia, as it was an agreement of the superpowers. In my view, it is impossible to punish anybody's political guilt by moving nations from one place to another on the basis of a collective guilt. Such things will not be spelled out in any agreement—or, not necessarily so—but it is necessary that we realize all these things clearly, that we admit to ourselves clearly that we expelled three million citizens from our country. Even if 99 percent of them were guilty, our laws do not recognize such a punishment as an expulsion and, moreover, on the national principle. [passage omitted]

The German side understands as well as we do that it is necessary to look to the future. Nevertheless, namely for this reason, it is necessary to admit even unpleasant things about the past. [passage omitted]

Prime Minister Marian Calfa Interviewed

Government Screening Process

AU2206161191 Prague MLADA FRONTA DNES in Czech 20 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Prime Minister Marian Calfa by Karel Hvizdala; place and date not given: "More on Government Screenings"]

[Text] [Hvizdala] The issue of screenings in the Federal Government has recently created further commotion. People are even beginning to say that two of your deputy prime ministers should be on the list of former State Security [StB] collaborators. Is there any truth to this?

[Calfa] At the end of April and again at the end of May—that is, on two occasions—the commission investigating the events of 17 November 1989 gave me a list of government members and deputy ministers listed in StB documents in various levels of involvement. I do not want to say collaboration because only a certain level means truly deliberate collaboration. I have to say that the commission mentioned everyone in these documents regardless of whether the document was positive or negative. To be exact, the commission mentioned three government members. "Negative findings" was written beside the names of two of them.

[Hvizdala] Despite this, these two were included on the list?

[Calfa] It is strange, but yes.

[Hvizdala] How many people were on this list as a whole?

[Calfa] The commission mentioned 16 with "negative findings" written beside the names of two of them. In other words, we cannot talk about 16, but about 14.

[Hvizdala] You were given only a list of individuals?

[Calfa] I was given the names and, in three lines, the nature of the collaboration—from what date to what date and the level of collaboration. In the case of the one government member who did not have "negative findings" written beside his name, they also supplied additional photocopies of certain documents.

[Hvizdala] What did you do then?

[Calfa] I immediately acquainted all the government members—whose deputies were involved—with these facts and I requested them to familiarize themselves with the appropriate documents in the 17 November commission and to try to reach a conclusion. In essence, this is what I did the day after I received the report.

[Hvizdala] What was the outcome of the ministers' inquiries?

[Calfa] The outcome was varied. Some ministers came to the conclusion that the document is unequivocal, that there was, shall we say—I do not know—a signature of collaboration, that the documents were handwritten, that there were even perhaps invoices.... A number of these deputies have been recalled from their posts.

[Hvizdala] How many unequivocal "cases" were there?

[Calfa] So far, four. I was given a deadline of 30 June to conclude this issue.

[Hvizdala] Will you manage it?

[Calfa] Yes, but it is complicated. I will give you a specific example. The commission described an individual on whom there is an entire document on actions as a collaborator. It is possible to prove that nothing has been taken out of or added to the document. It is five pages long and reveals that the deputy minister in question organized a Scientific-Technical Association visit to Vienna at the beginning of the 1970's and, in this connection, was at the passport and visa office two or three times. They asked him how many people are going, what they would do there, and whom they would meet there. When they came back, they wanted to know whom they had met, what they had discussed, and so on. And this individual, without his knowledge, was listed as a confidant. Later, he was even listed as a possible candidate for secret collaboration. Obviously, this decision was made without the individual in question knowing about it. It is simply impossible to describe everyone mentioned in these lists as an informer. Or, let me give you another example: This again involves an individual who worked in the energy sector. He was in a group that organized the construction of nuclear power plants and, as such, came into contact with economic counterintelligence. His collaboration consists of the fact that they asked him if foreigners are interested in our nuclear power plants, if foreign diplomats go there, and so on. It simply involved protecting the product, not informing on people.

[Hvizdala] Apart from the cases you cited—where no collaboration is evidently involved—you said that a minister is on the list....

[Calfa] I did not say minister, but government member. Understandably, this is a completely different matter and is more complicated. I convened a closed government session because of this and I have to say that, from the material made available to us by the commission, it is apparent that documents compiled by the StB in retrospect and describing past events are involved.

[Hvizdala] What time frame do they concern?

[Calfa] These are years in which no records were kept. All we had to go on was a short report written by an StB officer 25 years later which contained no evidence about the activity of the individual in question. There was no

record of collaboration, no written documents, no personal reports, no invoices revealing that someone had paid him, and so on. Our government colleague described the events in a manner completely different from the StB's description. I have to say that we thoroughly discussed this aspect of the case and both the president of the Republic and we in the government came—from what we had at our disposal—to a unanimous conclusion which was then made public. In this connection, I want to say that—in the climate that has been created—publishing a person's name and describing him as an StB collaborator, in my opinion, condemns this person or harms him. Not only him personally, but also his family and those around him. Therefore, if this collaboration is not genuinely proven, no name should be published. The government thinks that while there is no law precisely regulating the entire screening process, no names should be published. When there is a law, then government members and their deputies will be screened by the procedure laid down in it and, if the findings are positive, the conclusion will—understandably—be clear: The individuals in question will go.

[Hvizdala] How should this law appear in practice?

[Calfa] Based on the law, we will pronounce incompatibility between the findings and the execution of certain posts. We are working on the hypothesis that, as far as the state apparatus is concerned, we would pronounce incompatibility by giving retroactive notice of dismissal or by blocking an individual's appointment to a post. We want this category to apply to state administration staff from the level for which a university education is required. It seems to us that this is a sufficient identification mark. This applies at the central organs, federation, and republican levels. As far as local administration is concerned, we had in mind district council leaders, heads of financial offices, heads of employment offices, and so on.

Staff who are declared to be incompatible will have an opportunity to obtain a so-called finding. In other words, we want to establish a commission in the Interior Ministry made up of screened members—Interior Ministry staff and, from the laity, perhaps a lawyer and a priest who—on the basis of a query—would completely review the whole document and express a finding.

[Hvizdala] That is, only an active collaborator would have a positive finding?

[Calfa] Active collaboration has to be involved on the part of the individual in question. However, we do not want to specify it. We do not want it written that there has to be a financial document proving that he was paid for something. We do not want it written that he signed something or put something down in his own handwriting. The commission has to consider all the material comprehensively and come to a conclusion: whether a finding is positive or negative. In categories where a positive finding would mean dismissal or not accepting someone for a post, we want the employee to have the opportunity to protest in court the invalidity of the reason for giving notice. Of course, this is only a government proposal. I do not know whether the Federal Assembly will adopt it in exactly this form.

[Hvizdala] How will the screening process for journalists proceed?

[Calfa] As far as journalists are concerned, we are considering two possibilities: that only chief editors be screened and that the newspaper's registration be linked to the chief editors' screening. In other words, the chief editor could endanger the entire newspaper. We are relying on the newspaper to put itself in order.

[Hvizdala] And the second possibility?

[Calfa] The second possibility is that we would say that the wider group of editors has to screen itself and prove itself to its chief editor. In the event that the chief editor was inactive, the newspaper's registration could be endangered.

[Hvizdala] Let us suppose the screenings law is adopted in September. In your opinion, how long will the screenings take? Will this not mean work for years to come?

[Calfa] In his Conversations From Lany, the president of the Republic said that this should be a process limited by time. We also agree with this. We will suggest to the Federal Assembly that the law be in force until the end of 1993.

Speaks on Federation Talks

LD2206161991 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1750 GMT 21 Jun 91

["Ten Minutes With The Prime Minister" program; interview with Prime Minister Marian Calfa by unidentified announcer in Prague on 20 June—recorded; interviewer in Czech, Calfa in Slovak]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [announcer] During the Kromeriz constitutional talks the greatest emphasis was perhaps put on looking for a solution to the problem of a state treaty [statni smlouva] versus an agreement [smlouva]. What is the final solution then?

[Calfa] The representatives of the Christian Democratic Movement unequivocally insisted on having clearly stated in the name or in the text of the agreement in question that it is a state treaty between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. In fact it is not the case, as it is an agreement between the bodies of these republics; that is, between the Czech National Council and the Slovak National Council, which of course represent the sovereign republics. Thus the consensus reached was that we would understand the agreement as being concluded between the supreme bodies of state power of the republics as the representatives of these republics.

[announcer] Did the consensus you reached also concern the content of the agreement?

[Calfa] No, it did not. Namely because when we came to the questions of the content we encountered a great variety of views, because after all the content of this agreement is to be a certain idea of the republics about the desired form of the federation and above all about power-sharing, as this is the most important issue concerning the federation. In this sphere some views were very extreme—ranging from total rejection of the concept put forward by the president to full acceptance of the president's concept.

[announcer] What will be the relationship between the agreement and the Federal Constitution and the republican constitutions? I assume it is going to be a complicated process as there are several interlinked elements in it.

[Calfa] The representatives involved in the process who represent the forces represented in the two national councils as well as in the Federal Assembly reached a conclusion about the best course of action. They would attempt to push through a view in the Federal Assembly that the Federal Assembly should feel being bound by the content of this agreement when drafting the federal constitution. Nevertheless, in this sphere the Federal Assembly is totally sovereign and will be the only author of the federal constitution, which of course has to be in harmony with the constitutions of the republics.

[announcer] During the past week there have also been voices casting doubt on the significance of the Kromeriz talks, for example at yesterday's news conference by the Movement for Democratic Slovakia [MFDS].

[Calfa] This sort of attitude is very surprising, and I must say that Mr. Secansky, an MEDS representative who was at the meeting, adopted a curious attitude by saying that there is no point in talking about what forms the state will take, he did not want to say [words indistinct] federation, there is no point in talking about what form the state will take, because we do not know what it contains. Then when we began to talk about the content he simply had nothing to say, pointing out that he would comment later, because it had to be discussed and so forth. I do not know what there is to discuss because we have been debating these issues for three fourths of a year, and I think we are all completely clear about what form the federation should take. If the federation is preserved, it must be a fully fledged state with all its functions.

[announcer] Did you discuss variants other than a federation? Did you discuss, for example, a confederation?

[Calfa] Well, we discussed a number of forms. Mr. Secansky said that a specific form must be sought, that we ought to disregard the forms known elsewhere in the world, such as federation, confederation, or union, and that we should think up something specific for ourselves. I am against specific forms, because they have never stood the test of history, they have never been a good thing. [passage omitted]

[announcer] Perhaps this is relevant to yesterday's Slovak National Council [SNC] session, which decided that a constitution with full powers, in other words a constitution of a sovereign state, is to be drafted. To what extent does this tie in with what was agreed at Kromeriz?

[Calfa] The Kromeriz talks proceeded from the premise that, as far the federation and the republics are concerned, we will work together on drawing up the federal and republican constitutions because they must tally with one another, and also that the republics will agree on what I would call certain limits for the federation and in that sense they will in fact express their will to be part of the federation and their will about the content of that federation.

The political situation in Slovakia is evidently such that not even the political representatives speaking on their behalf are able to make the views which they are putting forward at these talks prevail in their own political clubs. This is an exceptionally interesting situation, but I want to say one thing: although the election programs—during the elections I was in Slovakia—refer unequivocally to sovereignty and to raising the level of statehood in Slovakia, and the election programs in the Czech lands make similar references too, none of the election programs contained the aim of splitting the common state. So I must say that if the SNC deputies are considering an independent constitution for a fully fledged state of their own, then in fact they are also saying that it is a constitution which will be at variance with the federal constitution.

A federal constitution is a constitution which takes over certain things on behalf of the states. Therefore, in my view the deputies have no mandate to take such a decision. In other words if they want to take such a decision, then the Slovak nation, the Slovak people, the citizens of the Slovak Republic, must once again have the opportunity to express their will. The SNC deputies definitely do not have any mandate to take a decision to break up the state, and neither do the deputies of the Czech National Council.

[announcer] Mr. Prime Minister, do you think that in one of the phases of drafting the constitutions a public discussion would be useful?

[Calfa] [passage omitted]

I am in favor of things being discussed, but such a phase has to be, of course, prepared. I mean that experts have to prepare the issues for discussion. Thus, as this phase which has just been concluded was the right one as it was necessary to prepare issues to be put forward to our public, in the same way it will be necessary in the subsequent phases to put forward our concepts for public

discussion. After all, the work is being done for the good of our public and not for us.

[announcer] President Vaclav Havel expressed doubts, he was skeptical about being able to stick to 28 October as the date for adoption of our constitutions. Do you think that another deadline will be adopted or did you even discuss such a date in Kromeriz?

[Calfa] We did not discuss any exact deadline in Kromeriz. [passage omitted]

The 28 October deadline is now really out of the question, above all because the constitutions have to be preceded by that agreement between the National Councils and as the situation has developed it is still far from a conclusion. My view goes as far as thinking that the Czech side has a different idea of the agreement from the one adopted by the Slovak side. And they will have to agree on it.

[passage omitted]

My wish is that the constitution is adopted in time for having the new elections carried out on its basis. Therefore, the next deadline is then May 1992 when the elections are to take place.

Slovak Prime Minister on Federation Talks

LD2206164591 Bratislava Ceskoslovensky Rozhlas Radio Network in Slovak 1100 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Interview with Slovak Prime Minister Jan Carnogursky by Lubomir Lindtner on 21 June; place not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Lindtner] The Kromeriz meeting was an important domestic political event of this week. I think that this interview cannot leave out this fact either. We could hear Mr Kusy [deputy head of the presidency office and head of the presidency's Bratislava office] telling Radio Free Europe that the moment when the breakthrough occurred was when a Christian Democratic Movement [CDM] representative dropped his stance and when, immediately afterward, the Civic Democratic Party chief decided to change his attitude. Thus, the two people in question were yourself and Mr. Klaus.

[Carnogursky] The problem at issue in the final phase of the Kromeriz talks was as follows: the president submitted his package of measures. In the beginning I myself had some misgivings, which boiled down to the following: it was apparent from the previous pronouncements made by the representatives of the Czech political scene that they see the concept of state treaty as a mere joint legislative initiative of national councils toward the Federal Assembly. This was unacceptable to us. In the beginning I had an impression that even this proposal from the president considers just this particular form of state treaty [zmluva]. After some explanation, it became obvious that it is not only a joint proposal of national councils to the Federal Assembly, but that it is, indeed, a real treaty concluded between the republics represented by national councils.

The fact that this is a real agreement has been further enhanced by the fact that the constitution, which will subsequently be endorsed by the Federal Assembly, is subject to ratification by national councils if it is in keeping with the concluded treaty. When this fact became clear to me, the president's proposal was acceptable to me.

The next factor was the Federal Assembly constitutional bill on the drafting of constitution, by means of which the amendment to the present constitution was to link the present constitutional situation with the treaty concluded between national councils. To tell the truth, this draft amendment of present constitution was not contained in the CDM's original proposal on the conclusion of a state treaty, because we did not regard it as unavoidable and we included this proposal only additionally, so as to meet half way the Czech side's demands for harmonizing the present constitutional situation with the future one.

[Lindtner] Mr. Klaus arrived with a quite radical stance, at least as far as his statement is concerned. What is your view of the change of his stance?

[Carnogursky] The stance of Minister Klaus was isolated in the Czech political representation. But, allow me to describe Minister Klaus' stance on this question—on the question of the constitutional system—as Czech-style populism.

[Lindtner] Mr. Meciar, representative of the Movement for Democratic Slovakia [MFDS] voiced an idea that the representatives of Slovak political parties were not very united, that what was lacking was a joint meeting prior to their departure for Kromeriz.

[Carnogursky] You see, the representatives of Slovak political parties were united at the meeting in Lany about a month ago, for example. This was the reason why I personally did not regard a special meeting of representatives of Slovak political parties as very topical, mainly because the MFDS, in particular, appears to me as too unreliable a political partner because it keeps changing its policies. [passage omitted]

At the Kromeriz meeting, MFDS representative Dr. Secansky spoke in favor of federation, but some two or three days later Moravcik, a MFDS deputy, spoke in the Slovak National Council against the federation. And thus it is simply difficult to conclude any agreements with such an unreliable partner, because one cannot predict how long they will actually stay in force.

[Lindtner] I would once again like to recall the disunity at the Kromeriz meeting. The list of answers to the president's questionnaire says much about the unequivocal positions of the Czech political representation,

which contained, say, 11 positive responses to the questions, while as far as the Slovak political representation is concerned, the figures are different. Six are in favor, three, four, or five did not make their views known....

[Carnogursky] Yes, this does, indeed, reflect the current state of Slovak political representation. But it is a task for national councils—for the Slovak National Council on the Slovak side—to draft some unified standpoint of the Slovak side and to conclude a treaty. But if it fails to unite, then there simply will be no treaty.

[Lindtner] How do you regard, from the viewpoint of your own participation in the Kromeriz meeting, the Slovak National Council resolution, which does not consider its conclusions as a basis, but as a point of departure for further work?

[Carnogursky] The Slovak National Council is the supreme body of the Slovak Republic state power, and this is why we have been stressing so far that it should be the Slovak National Council and no other body or representatives who should conclude an agreement with the Czech National Council. This is why the Slovak National Council has the full right to make such decisions as it considers correct.

And, finally, since it is a treaty, which should be the end result of the talks between the Czech and Slovak National Councils, then it is incorrect to state in advance what will be the outcome of this treaty, because this would not make it a free treaty. And so, from this point of view, I think that the Slovak National Council resolution is correct.

[Lindtner] President Havel answered in the Slovak legislature the question on certain degree of mistrust in current relations between the Czech and Slovak republics. How do you see this factor, where lie the causes for this mistrust, and how should we seek ways to remedy it?

[Carnogursky] This mistrust springs from a certain shift in the interests of the peoples—the Slovak and Czech peoples. Nowhere has there ever been an absolute concord of interests of two or more peoples, or if it was so than it existed for a very brief historical period. From this viewpoint it is quite natural that there are differences and disputes, which you termed mistrust, between Slovak and Czech representations. And the basic way of tackling or removing this mistrust is to stick to the truth, we must tell the truth to each other and we must observe agreements. Simply, if we agree on something, we must stick to it, because otherwise we shall not be able to do away with mistrust. But it is not only the issue of doing away with mistrust, for our failure to observe concluded agreements would simply inflict damage also on us.

[Lindtner] One of the factors which causes disputes is Slovakia's disproportionate representation in our country's representative corps abroad. Recently I was taken unpleasantly back by the answer of our ambassadress to the United States, Mrs. Rita Klimova, on Radio Free Europe. There was an intention to appoint a Slovak to one of the posts at the embassy. But the Foreign Ministry answered that a Slovak was not available. What course of action does the Slovak government intend to take in this respect?

[Carnogursky] This problem has been dragging on for a long time. The fact is that even though we are able to achieve a political agreement on a federal level—say on proportionate staffing by Slovaks—in practice the obastacles which have so far made it impossible for us to implement this principle in full are continually emerging. The obstacles we are encountering are that the requirements arrive quite late and so we are forced to quickly look for candidates. However, we regard this as one of the permanent roles and the Slovak government and the Foreign Ministry are dealing with this role and are compiling a permanent pool of personnel, candidates for the diplomatic service. We hope to be able to improve the current situation.

[Lindtner] A week ago you said that the success achieved after November 1989 should not be seen in relative terms. This week, the last convoy carrying Soviet soldiers left the republic. What is your view of this fact? After all, the departure of Soviet troops was among the first demands raised in November [1989].

[Carnogursky] It is a success of the current Czechoslovak foreign policy, it is a renewal of our state's sovereignty. It is a fact that deserves to be positively endorsed, positively assessed and positively recorded. On the other hand, I think that we should not turn it into a campaign and, in particular, into a campaign against the Soviet Union. The tradition of our relations with Russia and also with the Soviet Union, when one considers their medium-term prospects, is longer than the last 23 years and it is in our interest to maintain good character of these mutual relations.

Slovak Legislature Debates Constitution

AU2306153591 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 20 Jun 91 pp 1, 2

[Alena Melicharkova report: "The Post-Kromeriz Stumbling Blocks of Statehood; The 15th Session of the Slovak National Council Continued"]

[Excerpts] Bratislava—The agreement of Kromeriz, Slovak National Council [SNR] Chairman F. Miklosko said at the 15th SNR session yesterday, has made it possible for the SNR Presidium to submit to the plenum a draft resolution on procedures to be followed in settling the constitutional status of the Slovak Republic and in drafting its constitution. The deputies spent the entire morning session debating this resolution.

Following consultations with representatives of political parties and movements represented in [the Slovak] legislature, the SNR Presidium decided to set up a commission made up of 10 representatives of the above parties and movements, which will try to work out a single draft of the Slovak Republic Constitution on the basis of the

six drafts that have been submitted. F. Miklosko drew attention to the stumbling blocks which the commission must overcome.

Constitutional Dilemma

On the one hand, there is the demand that the constitution be conceived as a constitution of a state having all the powers of a sovereign state, on the other hand there is the view that it should not contain powers surrendered to the derived entity, that is, to the federation. The decision was therefore reached to draw up, in parallel, two versions of the constitution. The above commission will also be entrusted with drawing up the draft treaty between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. According to F. Miklosko, yet another commission will be set up, made up of 10 economic experts, which is to help define the extent of powers the federation needs to be a functional entity. As for the Declaration on the Sovereignty of Slovakia, submitted by 13 SNR deputies, the SNR Presidium decided to pass it on to the political clubs. The SNR Presidium recommends that, after the political clubs deliver their opinion, some ideas of the declaration be incorporated into constitutional documents and a special debate on the declaration be held.

A Single-Chamber Legislature

The "head" of the Slovak legislature then returned to the [17 June] talks at Kromeriz, to the treaty between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic that is to be drafted and on the basis of which a Federal Constitution is to be drafted. In his opinion, the ratification of the Federal Constitution should be laid down directly in the treaty. The Federal Assembly should change from a two-chamber legislature into a single-chamber legislature. The establishment of a Federal Council is being considered in this connection, to be presided over by the president of the common state. The Federal Council should have the right to return federal laws [to the legislature]. Executive power, that is, the government, should assume a similar shape.

More than 20 deputies spoke in the debate on the submitted draft resolution on procedures to be followed in drafting the constitution. [passage omitted]

Deputy Jozef Moravcik (Movement for a Democratic Slovakia) endorsed the adoption of the proposed resolution with the proviso that the text be amended. He demanded that the word "federation" be replaced by a word expressing a looser association. The direction to the further course of the debate was given by Peter Hatapka, who presented the position of the Club of Deputies of the Christian Democratic Movement [KDH]. "The KDH upholds the speedy adoption of the Slovak Republic Constitution as the constitution of a sovereign state with complete powers, that is, a "clean" constitution. It regards the conclusion of a treaty between the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic as the point of departure for settling the relationship with the Czech Republic," he said. He then endorsed the proposed resolution, but with amendments. They concerned, above all, the deletion of words determining that the future arrangement would be federal. He argued that it is up to the legislatures of the republics what kind of a treaty they will conclude and what constitutional arrangement will arise from it. His position received support from several KDH deputies. SNR Deputy Chairman Jan Klepac (KDH) said in this context that Prime Minister Jan Carnogursky spoke at Kromeriz not only about a federation but also about a confederation.

Deputies for the Party of the Democratic Left [SDL] drew attention to some imprecise formulations in the hastily submitted draft resolution. Lubomir Fogas (SDL) also raised the question of whether the treaty in question will be a treaty between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic or a treaty between the Czech National Council and the SNR and whether it will be binding for the Federal Assembly. Karol Plank, chairman of the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic, presented to the deputies in some detail the expert's view. He alerted them to some serious circumstances. He said, for example, that the treaty [between the republics] must contain provisions on the shape of the Federal Assembly. It should also establish a system whereby the Federal Assembly will be independent but will have to respect the positions of the national councils. Following a debate, F. Miklosko supported a resolution that would be worded more loosely and that would speak in its preamble about "points for our departure and procedures in drafting the constitution." He warned that for the Czech side, the deletion of the word federation would mean the state's breakup. [passage omitted]

After the lunch break the clubs of deputies met to discuss in detail, among other things, the previous statements in the plenum. Information has leaked to the lobbies about sharp disputes within the coalition, especially over deleting, or retaining, the word "federation" in the text of the resolution. After about four hours deputies took their seats again. Deputy Lubomir Fogas (SDL) read the new draft of the resolution. [passage omitted] Shortly before 1830 the deputies started a debate on the new draft.

Of the suggestions for extra provisions and changes that emerged from the debate, the legislature accepted only that put forward by Deputy Zdena Tothova (Green Party), according to which "the treaty between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic and the common constitution are understood as the point of departure for the future settlement of relations between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic." The deputies then approved the draft of the resolution by a majority of votes. Let us mention that the word federation figures only once in the resolution, in part "E," section 3, in which the SNR recommends that, after a debate on the drafts of constitutional documents in SNR bodies, these drafts be regarded as a point of departure for the political representation of the Slovak Republic in its talks with the political representations of the Czech Republic and

the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic on the constitutional arrangement of the state.

The SNR session continues today with an address by CSFR President Vaclav Havel.

Slovak VPN Conference Adopts Communique

LD2206210491 Bratislava Ceskoslovensky Rozhlas Radio Network in Slovak 1930 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] A communique has been issued at the end of the Slovak national-level conference of the Public Against Violence [VPN] which states that the PAV continues to feel responsible for the implementation of the government program. It also ensures from the communique that the participants in the conference confirm its unequivocal orientation toward an open society which means a law- governed state, legislative democracy, and development of self-administration. In the economic sphere, it means a free market.

Participants in the conference further confirmed their interest in changing the PAV into a modern party and recommended that the contributions voiced at the conference become the basis for discussion within the movement and for drafting the basic documents of the PAV republican congress. Participants in the conference recommend that the PAV's Slovak Council nominate commissions of experts, establish working groups to draft the program, statutes, and theses for the election manifesto to be discussed at the movement's session in the fall, and, appropriate to these tasks, adjust the professional make-up of the coordinating center, give training to managers, and prepare other organizational issues. Arising from the conclusions of the PAV Slovak national-level conference, conveyed to CTK by a representative of the conference's press department, mayors of cities, towns, and villages pointed to the bad financial situation of towns and villages and considered the demand to call early legislative elections as undemocratic and in contradiction of the valid election law.

Public Against Violence Rejects Slovak Separation

LD2306201191 Prague CTK in English 1820 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] Bratislava June 23 (CTK)—The Slovak Council of the Public Against Violence (VPN) today adopted an appeal describing as irresponsible the demands by some politicians that the Czechs and Slovaks discontinue their coexistence in the Czechoslovak federation.

Responding to the calls for confederation, the VPN warns that this term in Czechoslovak conditions means the break-up of the existing common state. Slovakia as subject to international law means a separate state, the appeal says.

In fact there are only two possibilities - a common democratic state, or its disintegration. Any attempt to create anything else than federation pesuppose the end of the common state. No third road exists, the call adds.

A separate Slovak state is advocated by the nationalist-orientated Slovak National Party. Also the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HZDS), which split from the VPN in April, is in favour of a confederation. The Christian Demoratic Movement (KDH), now the strongest force in Slovakia, wants coexistence with the Czech Republic until Czechoslovakia is admitted to integrated Europe. Afterwards, it wants to act as an independent entity.

Antall Addresses Democratic Forum Session

LD2306195291 Budapest MTI in English 1755 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 23 (MTI)—"The Hungarian Democratic Forum (HDF) has adopted the principles of both Christian democracy, reviving after the Second World War, and national liberalism, a great 19th century heritage of Hungarian democracy and pluralistic thinking that were deeply rooted in the ideas of Szechenyi, Kossuth, Deak and Eotvos, and paved the way for the emergence of a modern Hungary in the European sense of the word. National liberalism implies the simultaneous acceptance of political democracy, a modern, law-governed state and a market-driven economy", Prime Minister Jozsef Antall, president of the Hungarian Democratic Forum (HDF), said at the closing session of the first national meeting of the HDF's popular-national circle in Godollo, a town near Budapest, on Sunday.

"The idea of national liberal democracy is an indispensable element of the HDF. The Hungarian liberal thinking always included national and social elements. The HDF has approved, and laid down in its statutes, the trinity of popular-national, Christian democratic and Christian liberal ideas", Antall said. The Hungarian Democratic Forum is a centre or right-of-centre party, like so many other parties in Europe. It is particularly important for the Hungarian parties to define their affiliation. The HDF may find a common language with those who do this", Antall said.

Terming Hungary's current situation in Europe as unprecedented over the past few centuries and referring to the Soviet troops pull-out, Antall stressed that independence and sovereignty implied special responsibility in attitudes and common sense. The Hungarian prime minister said that all governments should be aware of the interests motivating the calculable actions of the Hungarian Government. Calculability is the basis of confidence, and confidence is particularly important in this region which is full of uncertainties, Antall said.

Troop Withdrawal Compensation Talks Continue

Defense Ministry Report

LD2206214391 Budapest MTI in English 2020 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 22 (MTI)—There are only formal changes in the attitude of the Soviet delegation which is holding talks on the financial implications of the troops pull-out: the flat refusals were replaced by diplomatic expressions. However, the gap between the positions of the negotiating parties has not narrowed, Colonel Gyorgy Keleti, spokesman of the Ministry of Defence, said after the Saturday round of talks.

The Soviet delegation invariably opposes that the closing protocol should contain the differences, which are mainly connected with the assessment of environmental damage and with the buildings, having an estimated value of 30,000 million forints, which are of no use for the Hungarians (pillboxes, concrete air-raid shelters). As a consequence, the biggest Hungarian claims would not be fixed in any document. General Shilov insists that the Hungarian side should lay down its standpoint in a separate document which would not be signed by the Soviet delegation.

The protocol compiled that way would only include technical matters and the Soviet claims, Keleti said. A protocol of this kind would not provide an appropriate basis for the subsequent, eventually political talks.

Since the Soviet delegation has not worked out a position based on calculations made under the mutually accepted methods, it is very difficult to collate their claims with the detailed Hungarian calculations. Furthermore, the Soviet delegation does not include appropriate experts, for instance environmental specialists. The Saturday talks were attended by two experts only. The Soviet side has now promised that seven experts would arrive from the Soviet Union on Sunday, Keleti said.

The talks are to resume on Sunday.

Military Official on Talks

LD2106203191 Budapest MTI in English 1318 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 21 (MTI)—The Thursday session of the Hungarian Government was also attended by Lieutenant General Antal Annus, state secretary of defence and Hungarian Government commissioner in charge of the Soviet troops pull-out, who proceeded to read out the list of establishments constructed with Hungarian funding and used up until now by the Soviet Army. From now on, these buildings will be used for public purposes.

Concerning the rumour that perhaps Lieutenant General Viktor Shilov was not the last Soviet soldier on Hungarian territory, Antal Annus told journalists at the government spokesman's briefing on Friday that the Hungarian authorities concerned had been led to believe that the one-time commander of the Soviet Southern Army Group was the last who left. Nevertheless, an investigation will be carried out into the substance of the rumour. Annus said he had no information of any desertion by Soviet soldiers in Hungary.

Annus expressed the hope that the sides would review the entire range of controversial issues in the financial talks on the Soviet troops pull-out. He said the Hungarian side was discontented with the Soviet approach to negotiations. Despite a previous promise, the Soviet delegation is yet to include an expert on environmental protection. There are some indications that the Soviet side does not take seriously the ecological damage it has caused, and is displaying an almost total indifference to the matter. For this reason, the Hungarian Government commissioner has not ruled out the possibility of involving foreign experts, should the two delegations fail

to reach an agreement. Hungary is of the view that the sides should agree on compromise solutions to the debated issues. This far though, the Soviet Union has shown no signs of any preparedness to reach compromises, Annus said.

Comment on Deadlock

LD2206160791 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1000 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] At the compensation talks in Budapest yesterday related to the Soviet troop withdrawal, the Hungarian and Soviet positions became completely inflexible. The Soviets are not willing to concede the Hungarian demand for environmental damages, and General Shilov did not even assent to the inclusion of those topics on which agreement was not reached in the closing protocol planned for the 25th [June]. Shilov said that otherwise the document would amount to several volumes. From Moscow, Gabor Izbeki tries to shed light on the background to the attitude of the Soviet negotiating delegation:

[Izbeki] The Soviet military and political leadership, not only in the case of Hungary but also of Czechoslovakia and Poland, holds the view that the sucessors of their former allies are asking for what they believe to be unrealistic sums as compensation for the environmental damage caused by the Soviet Army.

However, there is scarcely mention of this in the press. The newspapers did not even carry the brief TASS report on the new Soviet-Hungarian round of talks, from which it might have emerged that the Soviet Union had raised its demand to 100 billion forints in exchange for the transfer of the built installations. A problem for the officers and the Army is that those who return home have no dwellings, since the civilian population is also preoccupied with not having any. Therefore, why should an exception be made for the officers?

However, it emerges from the articles that the Soviets regard this topic as a prestige issue. Since they pulled out punctually, in return they expect the countries concerned, thus Hungary, not to take action that is overly disadvantageous for the Soviet Union on this issue. There are also opinions that these Hungarians are unreasonable. Due to the compensation dispute, they will leave thorns in the Soviets that will cost a much higher price in the cooling of relations than what they might possibly gain now.

However, in practice, the Soviet Union's current economic situation, completely rules out their paying even one dollar to the Hungarians. Proof is, for example, that they doubled the sum of their demand.

Soldiers Staying 'Illegally'

LD2306212791 Budapest MTV Television Network in Hungarian 1700 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] [Announcer] In the regions of Rackeve and Szigetszentmiklos [south of Budapest], County Pest police headquarters investigators have found Soviets staying illegally. We telephoned two responsible officials:

[Unidentified correspondent] Is the report true that Soviet soldiers who are staying here illegally have been taken to the transit camp in (Kerepestarcsa)?

[Unidentified official] What I can say in connection with this report is that it is true. In the course of the control procedure, it was established that four Soviet citizens are staying in this area without valid travel documents. It was also established that one of these is a professional soldier, a sergeant major. The others are civilians. Contrary to reports, they have no weapons. We will expel them from the country within 24 hours. This is now in progress.

We also established that four Soviet citizens are in the Dunavarsany area [south of Budapest]. They likewise did not have valid travel permits. They had a car with them and a large amount of cash and foreign currency. At present an identity check has not yet been completed, but we continue to follow with attention the movements of Soviet citizens staying here.

Energy Price Hikes Compensation Accepted

LD2206142491 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1300 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] An agreement at the Interests Coordinating Council! The reporter is Laszlo Garday:

[Garday] The government spokesman accepted the employee proposal for five billion forints compensation for energy price increases. This was announced a few minutes ago by Peter Kiraly, state secretary at the Ministry of Finance, to the satisfaction of employers and employees. The state secretary said that one of the conditions of the agreement is that social policy measures will not extend into next year because these guarantees cannot be provided at the present time.

One-time payments will be made from the five billion forints, according to need, to those who are receiving family allowances and to pensioners whose income is below 8500 forints. The decision about the exact amount of the compensation payments will be made after the the discussions of the ad hoc committee.

Sejm Rejects Senate Amendments to Electoral Law

LD2106142391 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 1255 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] The Sejm has ended it afternoon session. The deputies were in favor of the Sejm Constitutional Commission and rejected by the required two-thirds majority all four of the Senate's amendments to the electoral law.

Walesa Threatens To Dissolve Parliament

LD2306210291 Warsaw TVP Television Network in Polish 1753 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Speech by President Lech Walesa at a meeting at St. Brygida's Church in Gdansk on 23 June—recorded]

[Text] Six months is both a lot and a little time, but this is the period of time I needed to get acquainted with the matter of governing. Of course, you can say that this has been a bit too long, and many bad things have happened during this time. True. I was also wrong in many cases. In many cases I failed. But yes, I am coming to you, I am coming because I do not like what I see. I did not go to Belweder in order not to meet our expectations. I went there because I knew that if I waited a little longer, none of us would have been able to go there.

You have your president to serve you and to do everything to make our common dream come true, but of course within the limits of reality. Sometimes you tell me, well brother, do something about it. But I remind you of 1980. We were to win opportunities and then do the rest together. I am still on the verge, still on the verge of democracy, pluralism, and everything we promised ourselves—or slightly less democracy. I have your permission for democracy, for pluralism, and for always being with you. This I promise you, but on other matters we have to talk, and I will continue to come here, to apologize, and to ask because a few things have gone very badly indeed.

However, I want to say that if somebody thinks that the president carried out the purges badly, I want to say that in the president's [office] only one man from the old system remains. Apart from him I have purged everyone. Now, look you, have you done the same at the grass roots? Or maybe the president has to do it. Yes, the president will help you. I am getting off the international platform and I am coming back to you. Poland will be victorious. Poland must say that many of our people failed the test. I think that as we won in the old times—and you remember how difficult things were then—it is equally difficult now because the work is different from fighting. Then we were together, we were united by the enemy, the communists.

Today there are divisions of power, divisions of the spoils. Some would like to grab everything. Some things today—just look, many are pretending to be great democrats, but remember how it was. I do not want to judge anyone but when I wanted to expand democracy, when I was saying to Henryk Wujec on the side, let some people in. Then what did democracy do? It resigned and everyone left my citizens committee.

Let us go on, when again in the Sejm our strong movement was doing all right, when it was trying to change, to move one of the great professors. Then what did this great democracy do? It created the Democratic Union, it went to the side. When our great friends, who once stood here, went to prepare the takeover of the president's office, not necessarily to Walesa's advantage, then at the last moment they forgot why they went there in the first place. Look now, with the government, when many things have nearly been successful, when we really asked to go together, then when the electoral campaign for the office of president was lost the whole government resigned. It is either all or nothing. Today [words indistinct]. So look out, because the next jump has been prepared.

I am ready, I am ready for resolute measures. I have plans, some very difficult plans, but I want to be faithful to you. I will not do anything that will go over my authority, which I got from you and for which I fought side by side with you. If I am caught by such a surprise then forgive me, but I am the president who has to prevent Poland from dangers. Look, many things are going wrong. One of the great men who spat on us and arrested us and contributed to Popieluszko's murder continues to do the same today.

The fact that he writes about the president's children behaving badly, or the president himself, that is all right, for the well- being of the president one can read this sort of thing. But when he is desecrating sacred values, when he encourages those with black flags, then ladies and gentlemen, where are we headed? Nobody will mean anything then, everything will be for desecration. Therefore, the time has come for self-control on some points, the time has come to say: Enough my man, you are the perpetrator of past murders and today you are encouraging the ignorant youth to more murders. You have no right to do this and we will get to you, together we will get to you, and we will have the remit [przyzwolenie] for this, we will have democracy.

[Shouts from the crowd: "Dissolve parliament"] Dissolve parliament? Ladies and gentlemen, since these voices keep repeating themselves [prolonged applause] now I want to show Geremek and others that he is wrong, that if I want, then I will get society's permission to dissolve parliament in a democratic way, (?I have no doubt of this). [shouts of approval and clapping from the crowd] Walesa did not prepare these people. And look, I will show you [parliament] in a minute how many people there are who are tired of your idle chatter and who favor dissolving parliament. Show Poland, hands up all those in favor [shouts from the crowd, general uproar] Michnik, democracy is and will continue to exist. We must go with democracy and the nation and not think that you are the only one who is right. Thank you. [applause, shouts of "Long live the president!"]

[Unidentified person] Thank you. [crowd falls silent]

[Walesa] Of course, we have to come down to you. Things are bad at enterprises. We have to come down and help you. I am going to come and encourage others. We will come down and join you, but not to win presidential elections again. I have already won. Now I want you to win, so that your are not deceived [applause], so that finally Solidarity means solidarity but in those places where it is needed. [applause]

[Unidentified person] First we want to weed out the Sejm and the Senate, the parliament, to weed it out.

[Walesa] [Words indistinct], Madam, (?altogether I have had) three options (?given to me). I have still got two that have not been reported. I am going to choose those options which... [changes thought] Of course, they will be from these hearings from you. I am already going to hit the road all around Poland the day after tomorrow. Now I am here and the day after tomorrow I am going to hit the road all around Poland and I am asking, I am asking here what, which is the best option. But today I am not yet offering them to you. I am going to be back here in a week, because earlier there probably will not be a decision. So we are going to talk again and then I will tell you which option is probably going to be used, after consultations, after all.

[Unidentified person] Do not be scared, sir. Drive them all out to the devil.

[Walesa] I am not scared of anyone but God. [applause]

[Unidentified person] Great, that's it. [applause] Dissolve the parliament. Dissolve it.

[Walesa] Someone might say to me why is it all so slow. The matter—I was the union chief, but the matter of governing the country is not all that straight forward. At the same time we must not confuse—there is legislative authority, that is parliament, executive authority—the government and me—the regulator that does not have many powers. In this connection I had to—the amount of time I spent reeling from wall to wall, the number of mistakes I made—only I wanted to do things. I cannot fit within it, and what did I have offered to me? If he spoke properly, if he had good advisers, they would advise him how to speak properly. You know what they would have advised me? That I am not allowed to come out into the street because the law does not allow me to...[shouts from the crowd] That is how this law is made, so that I do not do anything. [applause, indistinct shouts]

Yes, you see, but to govern the whole country responsibly is not all that easy. That is why... [changes thought] Furthermore, we want to fight lawlessness with law, we want to fight injustice with fairness. These are nice slogans, but very difficult. It is possible, it is possible to realize our slogans. But we, from above, have to come down again and begin all over again in a different way, get down to Solidarity again, Solidarity, but not the one that has gone uncontrolled. It has gone this way because this struggle has gone on at the top, but I have worked out what is being done there.

I know what is what, that those from the left are very close and they never move to the right, but always to where the power is. And the people? Let them talk about what they want. The time was needed to notice everything. I repeat, the president will not do anything, even the best and the holiest, if he will not be with you, and if there will be no understanding between us. The understanding is most important and the rest is an offshot. [crowd shouts: "Long live the president"]

ZCHN Expresses Concern Over Electoral Debate

LD2206204391 Warsaw PAP in English 1921 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 22—The National-Christian Union (ZCHN) expressed its concern over the results of parliamentary debates on the electoral law here on Saturday.

"By rejecting the principles of the electoral law proposed by the president and the Senate, the Sejm, whose composition reflects a political contract, entered into opposition against the democratically elected organs of the Polish state," reads a communique of the Union's main board issued here on Saturday.

The board expressed the opinion that the president should "undertake necessary steps guaranteeing security and independence of Poland and the staging of free elections not later than by the end of this October."

ZCHN's leader Wieslaw Chrzanowski attending a press conference on Saturday expressed his concern over the developments within the Polish Peasant Movement saying at the same time that the recent removal of Polish Peasant Party (PSL) Chairman Roman Bartoszcze from his office was a scandalous act. ZCHN representatives met on saturday with the PSL leader.

During the press conference ZCHN representatives said that it is necessary to "prepare history textbooks presenting the true history of Poland," to improve the unfavorable situation in rural areas and agriculture and to bring Poland closer to NATO.

Parties View President-Sejm 'Conflict'

LD2206182291 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 1700 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Referring to the conflict between the president and the Sejm on the question of electoral law and also the fact that representatives of the Presidential Office have put forward irresponsible theses, suggesting the possibility of a dissolution of the parliament that would be contrary to the constitution, the Presidium of the Democratic Union [UD] warns against radical political solutions. Their result, the grouping claims, would be to threaten state order and the sense of civic security.

The political calendar for the coming four months is set. It contains the end of the term of office of the parliament and free elections. These are the political resolutions that Poland requires, the UD stresses.

The National Council [RK] of the Polish Peasants' Party Solidarity [PSLS] has acknowledged that the decision of the Sejm on the rejection of the Senate amendments to the electoral law does not serve political calm and stabilization. The law adopted by the Sejm might cause the fragmentation of political forces in the future parliament, make difficult the creation of the new government, and as a result destablize the political scene for a longer period of time. In the view of the party, corrections to the economic policy of the government that is being implemented at the moment are indispensible. The PSL's of RK has expressed unease at the development of the situation in the Polish Peasants' Party [PSL]. The factional struggles in this party, it was stressed, do not serve the good of the countryside and the peasant movement.

The authorities of the Christian-National Union [ZChN] have been meeting. The press spokesman of the union, Ryszard Czarnecki, and member of the Main Board Antoni Macierewicz now speak:

[begin recording] [Czarnecki] The ZCHN received the results of the deliberations of the Sejm on the electoral law with unease. For a longer period of time now, we see in the activities of the contractual majority in the Sejm a conscious intention to delay the reconstruction of a democratic and independent Polish state. The contractual Sejm is opposing its will to the democratically chosen bodies of the Polish state. We state with indignation that this became possible as a result of an alliance of deputies from the UD with postcommunist forces. We feel that in the present situation, the president ought to take the indispensible measures for the guarantee of the security and independence of Poland.

[Macierewicz] This action, perpetrated yesterday, disqualifies the functioning of this Sejm. This creates a situation of political crisis, the resolution of which can ensue solely as a result of the activities of the president. In this respect, we are ready to grant him all the political support that we are able to supply. [end recording]

'Solidarity' Leaders Discuss Political Role

AU2406080991 Warsaw TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC in Polish 14 Jun 91 pp 1, 18, 19

["Transcript" of discussion with Marian Krzaklewski, "Solidarity" chairman; Bogdan Borusewicz, "Solidarity" deputy chairman; Jan Rulewski, "Solidarity" deputy chairman; Maciej Jankowski, member of the presidium of the "Solidarity" National Commission; Andrzej Slowik, member of the presidium of the "Solidarity" National Commission, and hosted by Andrzej Gelberg, editor-in-chief of TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC, and Jozef Orzel, deputy editor-in-chief of TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC; place and date not given: "'Solidarity' Will Do Its Job"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC] The union's political program is changing—some would say that it is undergoing a dramatic change. You, however, are responsible for the direction of that change.

[B. Borusewicz] The union has its leadership, and it should set the general trend, assign objectives, and analyze the situation. However, we are a democratic trade union and a social movement. We may cease to function if we fail to take account of social expectations. The National Commission cannot instruct its members to do something, even go on strike, if they do not want to. There is no centralism, but there is loyalty to the union. The National Commission cannot expel a rank-and-file member from the union, because he did not carry out something or because he holds a different opinion. That is why within "Solidarity" there must be a balance between spontaneity from below and the course chosen by the leadership.

[A. Slowik] It seems to me that at this time one can no longer believe in the effectiveness of spontaneous activity, because there are substantial differences regarding interests and goals depending on where one is operating. A factory commission, a regional board, and the National Commission may all have different priorities. It may transpire that spontaneous action will result in a serious conflict between the interests of individual branches of the economy or regions. Under these circumstances, the union's national governing bodies must provide conscious leadership, and do so not by imposing discipline, but by means of convincing argument. The government is not pursuing a protective policy, and the union cannot afford to indulge in spontaneous, unrestrained activity. We can no longer arrive at what is desirable by trial and error, to establish what is desirable through waging a struggle.

The law on trade unions will not solve everything. The formula for negotiations proposed by Boni is a blind alley. There are still no democratic institutions that would facilitate a smooth transition through all the stages envisaged by the law. Above all, there is no time now for the entire democratic machine to be used in the same way as in countries that are much older democracies and have methods for resolving social conflicts that have been tried and tested over many years.

[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC] What goal does "Solidarity" have at the present time?

[A. Slowik] On the one hand, we hear charges that the union is hampering reform and on the other hand, we also hear charges that the union is not campaigning for another one or two million zlotys unlike the National Trade Union Confederation. The first charge, which is often leveled in the press and in parliament, is stupid. There has never been a movement anywhere in the world that has displayed so much concern for the interests of society and the state as "Solidarity." The union is in a crisis, but I think that it will overcome it if it accurately defines what it wants to do, in what way, and in defense of what interests. However, I see no possibility of the

union being able to operate in the manner that some quarters are seeking to impose on us—that is say, as a union that solely pursues wage demands, and is not concerned about weightier issues. Employee interests and those of citizens are linked; the union must engage in politics, although it cannot be a political party. It is important that the union should be professional, but it is not enough for the union to have specialists. It must also create the political conditions in which a union can operate. At the moment, such conditions do not exist in Poland. The entire political arena from which the union has withdrawn is not favorable. It is being burdened with responsibility for the actions of the politicians who have emerged from "Solidarity." There are higher necessities, and the president or the prime minister should frankly tell society what we can afford. Then we can talk about whether the union is right or whether the government is right. Have we already reached the limit regarding the reforms that can be implemented or is there a danger that we will overstep that limit and there will be a return to the past.

[M. Krzaklewski] Under the Reds, political success made trade union successes possible. Today, the reverse is true. There are still areas in which political successes can be obtained—completing the process of abandoning communism and instituting democratic reform—but in order to obtain political success, we must score union successes.

[A. Slowik] But no politician will give the union credit for political success. They will take the credit for themselves.

[M. Jankowski] I would like to answer the question with an anecdote: I took part in a discussion with some serious people from the Sejm on the subject of a pact for Poland. An interesting issue emerged—someone must sign and implement the pact apart from "Solidarity." It turns out there is, in effect, no government, because the government has a shaky foundation, one does not know what political forces support it, and it is a transitional one. There is no parliament, because the present one is governed by a contract, and so one. So, all that remains of the pact is a union that is to sign the pact.... Is it to sign a pact with itself? It is not a pact that we need, but constitutionally guaranteed union rights, framed in a way that will make it possible to exercise them.

[A. Slowik] No one who was in "Solidarity" should expose "Solidarity" to the risk of defeat. What will happen if "Solidarity" loses the support of the public? Who will remain on the battlefield? Who will remain in the workplace—the National Trade Union Confederation? It is a question of the responsibility borne by the politicians who have emerged from "Solidarity." They expect us to practice self-restraint and non-interference regarding, for example, the question of personnel appointments in treasury offices, which are being taken over by the old nomenklatura. You should not interfere, because you are a trade union! They should understand that they will not be a substitute for a trade union and Michal Boni should not lecture "Solidarity" on how it should behave and what its business is.

[J. Rulewski] We will not agree to being porters wearing "Solidarity" livery in the Third Republic. [passage omitted]

[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC] How should the union behave when parties that emerged from "Solidarity" come to the union seeking support before the elections?

[M. Krzaklewski] They are already doing that.

[A. Slowik] We should politely listen to what such petitioners have to say and then—like the church—politely ask them about what the union stands to gain.

[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC] Is the union counting on achieving success in the elections?

[J. Rulewski] Anyone who stands in an election thinks about victory. Thus, to my mind, the congress resolution on limited representation for the union in parliament is mistaken. A union activist cannot be prime minister, but someone who has a mandate from the union can. The "Solidarity" election program must be a program for everyone and not just a program for its members. If "Solidarity" puts forward a program for just one group, it will lose. It always achieved victories in the past, because it was open to everyone. If victory proves to be impossible, we will opt for the principle of the lesser good—a coalition.

The move from communism to capitalism cannot be achieved at a stroke. There has to be a transition period, and that provides "Solidarity" with an opportunity to combine those elements that are the cornerstone of the union—the dignity and rights of man—with a free market economy.

[M. Krzaklewski] It should be a program that will rapidly create an employer, but will also provide a formal definition of the relations between employer and employee. A union that becomes a participant in management lies in the interest of the modern employer. German employers draw employees into management.

[A. Slowik] An employer will always seek to extract higher productivity from his employees. If he does not do so by using intimidation, but by improving conditions, then we will find a common language.

[B. Borusewicz] He will have to begin by using threats, and only later....

[A. Slowik] It is the union's job to ensure that threats are not used.

[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC] In what way will the union be able to direct its deputies? Will they enjoy sovereignty or will the National Commission act like a politburo and issue them with instructions?

[A. Slowik] The way in which supervision is exercised over the union's representatives in parliament must,

above all, rest on creating a feeling of security for deputies who might run the risk of being expelled from the union. The National Commission cannot order an expulsion, but a factory commission can. A deputy can act against the special interests of his factory commission and the National Commission must defend him. On the other hand, the National Commission must ensure that deputies implement its program. It is also a question of trust. I think that the union knows its union activists well enough to be able to choose its representatives.

[J. Rulewski] Walesa chose his team correctly, but did not exercise enough supervision; he did not provide discipline by overseeing the work that was subsequently carried out.

[M. Krzaklewski] Most of the people that we will choose will be people who hold posts in the union and have done so for years. If a deputy is a member of a particular structure, then he is bound to it by the union statute.

[M. Jankowski] The same risk exists for all of society and every party, because there is no guarantee that a deputy from the Center Accord will not, for example, go over to the Social Democratic Party of the Republic of Poland or vice versa. In a normal country, a guy who breaks an agreement and hoodwinks the electorate should and does suffer political death.

[B. Borusewicz] Our representatives in parliament should be subordinated to the club presidium and the club presidium has to be linked to the National Commission. Deputies are not elected by the union, but by society, and so they cannot be treated in an opportunistic manner, because if they were to be, we would simply have a revolt on our hands, and it would be difficult to hold that against them.

[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC] A deputy will have to observe club discipline on issues concerning the union, but what about other issues?

[B. Borusewicz] It cannot be the case that a deputy will enjoy the escort provided by the club for half the way, and can then sail along as he pleases for the rest of the way.

[M. Jankowski] A deputy cannot be a siren.

[B. Borusewicz] The union does have to adopt a stance on and influence every decision, including political ones, but the club will have to.

[J. Rulewski] Everything indicates that the union will have to develop a political formation. However, can we afford to create such a formation? The need does exist. Many first-rate people are leaving the union every year: people who have proved their worth in the workplace, people of high political and moral caliber. They are going off to enter all kinds of political organizations. It is a pity. I am searching for ideas for a political vehicle that would not be political, but would draw on the universal "Solidarity" traditions. It would not be geared toward doctrine, but toward solving problems.

[M. Jankowski] There is no organization that has demonstrated its commitment to the public interest in the way that "Solidarity" has. It also succeeded in defending its unity, although everything possible was done to cause the union to fall apart, but it has not fallen apart, and despite the differences of opinion that exist, it is still doing its job.

Nastase Reviews Berlin CSCE Meeting

AU2206174791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1664 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 22/6/1991—On coming back from Berlin where he took part in the meeting of the CSCE countries' Council of Ministers, the minister of foreign affairs of Romania, Mr. Adrian Nastase, stated to the press:

The meeting has been a highly important, maybe historical, moment owing to its institutional framework and to a geographical generalization as to European countries through the inclusion of Albania among the CSCE countries. The Council, which has been so far the most important institutional structure, concentrated on major questions related to the building of European security, and on assistance to the new democracies taking shape in Eastern Europe. The meeting launched an essential element referring to the Euro-Atlantic community, that is a more powerful organization of the relationship between the countries in our continent and the American ones—the United States and Canada.

From this angle, we are witnesses of a significant moment in producing a new security formula which is already trusted in America. As for the East European countries, emphasis was placed on the Western countries' commitment to supporting the new democracies they are building. These were essential questions of a general character.

There were also specific aspects related to our continent such as, for instance, the European architecture, and a survey of the concrete situation in Europe. There was also a document that referred to Yugoslavia, which was highly balanced and underlined the need for the democratic processes in Yugoslavia to continue and for its unity and territorial integrity to be backed. Documents were adopted following direct talks between the foreign ministers.

As for the activity of the Romanian delegation, we tried to point to certain major ideas and to make include in the agenda of the next meetings some suggestions concerning the institutionalization of several domains, more particularly the economic reforms, a due support for such reforms within a forum we proposed, and the creation of a CSCE human rights commission apt to integrally control all obligations in this sphere not only in Romania but also in all the CSCE countries.

The meeting also approved of a new mechanism in emergency cases, according to which a session may be called to examine such situations only by twelve member countries.

The Romanian foreign minister also mentioned that he had in Berlin highly important interviews with the foreign ministers of the U.S.A., Germany, the Netherlands, Austria, Greece and Albania.

FSN Condemns Extremist, Chauvinist Articles

AU2106184891 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1801 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 21/6/1991—Noting that over the last period a number of periodicals started running articles expressing extremist stands, promoting nationalist-chauvinistic theses and slogans, the National Salvation Front [FSN] expresses in a communique sent to ROMPRES concern over the tendency to revive stands which it considered belonged to a history we want definitively gone and never to happen again. The restoration of outlooks and ideas which have previously led to well-known social conflicts and dramas and which are now condemned, with good reason, by all democratic forces, serves in no way Romania's effort to open itself to democracy, modernity and future, the communique reads.

The theses of the constitution, adopted by Romania's Parliament, firmly ban urging to national, racial, class, religious hatred, incitement to discrimination. In its programme, through the stands it has taken, the National Salvation Front rejected and rejects any kind of extremism, any attempt to divide Romania's citizens according to ethnic, religious or other criteria. The attempt to take advantage of the economic and social difficulties of the present stage to the end of promoting chauvinistic, anti-Semite or fascist-type outlooks is dangerous and worrisome since it can put the fate of democracy in Romania in jeopardy.

Believing that extremism can lead but to extremism, in a vicious circle of intolerance and violence, the National Salvation Front firmly condemns any manifestation of this kind. It is alien to the authentic Romanian spirit and to the democratic outlook on normal relations in a society in which, in our opinion, all citizens are equal, and the society is in a position to guarantee fundamental human and civic rights the communique reads in conclusion.

Markovic Outlines Solutions to Crisis

LD2106150491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1159 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Speech by Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic at the SFRY Assembly on 21 June: "Stands and Proposals of the Federal Excecutive Council for the Resolution of the Crisis and the Structuring of Relations in the Yugoslav Community."]

[Text] Belgrade, 21 Jun (TANJUG) - Respected delegates, the Federal Executive Council [FEC] has decided to present to you its views on the current crisis, as well as its opinions and proposals on how to resolve it and how to organize relations in the Yugoslav community. By doing this the FEC is in fact making yet another contribution to the peaceful and democratic denouement of our internal relations and the further development of reforms and democratization of our society.

This is in fact a presentation of the document that is in front of you. I hope that, if this is necessary, we, including me, will take part in a discussion if we jointly conclude that this is essential.

The FEC—in line with its constitutionally set rights, duties, and responsibilities for the situation in the country—has been proposing and undertaking measures for a way out of the crisis and for overcoming the contradictions facing our society. To this end the economic reform program and further changes in the political system have been carried out. Assemblies of some republics, however, refused to approve the amendments to the SFRY Constitution that the SFRY Assembly Federal Chamber adopted last August. Other FEC proposals regarding ways of overcoming the crisis were not endorsed either. The political situation in the country has suddenly been exacerbated. Interethnic conflicts, which have brought us almost to a state of civil war, have occurred. Moreover, illegal armed formations were set up, and the civilian population has been armed on a national and party basis on a mass scale. The implementation of the economic reform, of which foreign experts had a high opinion and which started to yield very positive results, was blocked by worsening political and interethnic relations in the country. As a result, development is stagnating, and major social problems causing widespread dissatisfaction have arisen.

At the same time, the SFRY Presidency, which ought to have taken part in the resolution of the crisis and in the creation of conditions for reaching an agreement on the future order of the Yugoslav community, was blocked, something which impairs the work of the SFRY Assembly.

The Yugoslav crisis is the subject of preoccupations and serious concern on the part of influential European and world factors. They consider that there is a danger of civil war, which, quite apart from the serious consequences internally, could lead to serious destabilization and conflicts in the region and in Europe.

The FEC deems it essential to remove the political barriers to the functioning of the system, which have also resulted in a halt in the economic and political reforms and the development of democratic relations in society. Only in such way can the conditions and prerequisites be created for the renewal of the seriously damaged trust among the Yugoslav nations and their republics; for the restoration of the lost international reputation of our country; and renewal of confidence necessary for offers of international support and the procurement of the financial resources that have already been offered. Without it, a way out of the crisis and the realization of the economic and political reforms cannot be achieved.

The FEC believes that simultaneous and coordinated involvement of all forces in society is essential in resolving the current political, social, economic and other problems, and in reaching agreement on laying down the principles upon which future relations in the Yugoslav community are to be organized.

To neglect the ongoing, everyday problems of the people would only exacerbate the social conflicts in society and thus further distance us from solutions to future relations in the country. On the other hand, essential but peaceful agreement on these relations the Yugoslav community are to be founded would not be successful if the problems of the current system and the lives of citizens meet with insurmountable barriers and difficulties.

I

The FEC considers that to resolve all the more serious economic and social problems, it is essential to ensure the functioning of the system in the transitional period until agreement is reached on the future of Yugoslavia on new bases. This facilitates the implementation of the economic reform program and the development of the economic system and macroeconomic policies, and their consistent realization.

The further implementation of the economic reform program calls for:

—Restoring the convertibility of the dinar as the single Yugoslav currency by means of monetary and fiscal policies and support from abroad, and by taking additional measures to strengthen the foreign currency reserves that are needed to ensure the functioning of the country's foreign exchange market;

—the urgent adoption of proposed economic policies and the creation of a macroeconomic climate favorable to structural changes in accordance with the new role of the state in the market economy ;

—the guaranteeing of further restructuring of ownership on the basis of privatization as an essential prerequisite for overall social reform, including the interests of workers and citizens in the development of ownership democracy, which implies halting the pronounced nationalization [podrzavljenje] of social ownership;

—halting on the reform bases—through structural adjustment and market orientation—the global tendencies of drastic decline in production and the social product, beginning with the recovery of production activities in certain branches of the economy as early as 1991. This which should create the prerequisites for the start of healthy growth in production and development in the coming year.

To this end it is essential to undertake a number of measures and activities, and in particular:

—the immediate removal of all remaining barriers—regulations and practices—that have disrupted the Yugoslav market (of goods, labor, capital and know-how);

—the adoption of the budget of the Federation for 1991 as an essential condition for the realization of its economic and social functions;

—ensuring means for the protection of citizens' savings—which no one can bring into question—through the institution of Yugoslavia's public debt, which should be served from real sources;

—the adoption of real social programs for the resolution at all levels of the accumulated and dramatically exacerbated social problems threatening to explode; to this end, necessary financial funds ought to be secured;

—ensuring from all sources, especially foreign, additional funds required to stop the erosion and even further decline in the production and market supply, and to ensure low inflation levels, which must remain one of the basic objectives of the macroeconomic policy, without which there is no sound growth and development.

II

Until an agreement on the future relations in the country is reached, it is pressing to stop a further erosion and disintegration of the legal and political system, to lift the blockade in the functioning of country's legal institutions in performing their tasks enshrined in the SFRY Constitution and to create conditions for state bodies to carry out their functions efficiently.

To this end, it is necessary:

1. to immediately lift the blockade in the functioning of the SFRY Presidency by proclaiming the president and vice president of the SFRY Presidency on the basis of the SFRY Constitution and in accordance with the rotation set in line with the SFRY Presidency standing orders, and in this way remove one of the biggest political problems that now exists in the functioning of our system. The responsibility for this is borne by those who persistently refuse to do this.

2. To lift the blockade in the functioning of the SFRY Assembly regarding its constitutionally set tasks—marginilization of its role in the resolution of the crisis and the reaching of an agreement on the future of the Yugoslav community. [sentence as received] It is necessary to ensure uninterrupted work and functioning of the SFRY Assembly's chambers (regular participation of all delegates and delegations from the republics and provinces in the work of the chambers, timely adoption of stands in the republican and provincial assemblies, respect for common interests and the created obligations to be shown in harmonizing and decisionmaking procedures and others.) It is necessary to agree about multiparty elections for the SFRY Assembly Federal Chamber and about the constitution of the Chamber of Republics and Provinces through elections in the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and the Autonomous Province of Kosovo.

3. Until the final agreement on the future of structuring of relations in the Yugoslav community is reached, attempts to reshape Yugoslavia or its constituent parts, or the country's internal and external borders, will not be permitted. In this respect attempts to disrupt the borders system, the appropriation of customs and taxes as direct sources of the federal income, and other behavior contrary to the regulations, will not be allowed.

Until a democratic agreement on the fate and future of the Yugoslav community is reached, the FEC, in line with its constitutional powers and responsibilities, is resolute in opposing most energetically and with all leval means all unilateral demands and actions, as well as hegemony and imposition of one's will on others, that could jeopardize the SFRY's freedom, independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.

4. In all republics it is necessary to take firm measures to prevent the deterioration of interethnic relations and to secure conditions and the time for a peaceful and democratic resolution of the problems, above all by legal means. This means, in the first instance, guaranteeing the security of the person and property of all citizens; the confiscation of illegal weapons from citizens; the disbanding and disarming of illegal formations; the defusing of conflict situations and taking legal action in areas where interethnic conflicts are likely to occur, which should facilitate the operations of the competent organs, the coordination of the activities of the military and civil organs, the lifting of the information blockade, and other things that dominate in our country.

5. It is essential to tackle more fully, on long-term bases, and without delay the democratic solution of current problems in Kosovo and the creation of preconditions for establishing the normal functions of the relevant organs in Kosovo.

III

1. The Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia has adopted a resolution on the consensual separation [razdruzivanje] of the SFRY which has been sent to all republican assemblies and which proposes the consensual separation of Yugoslavia into two or more sovereign states.

The letter of the Slovene Assembly president to the SFRY Assembly president says that despite repeated invitations only the Croatian Assembly has responded to the resolution. He also informed the Yugoslav Assembly that with this resolution the process of dissociation is beginning, and that the independence and autonomy of the state of Slovenia will be proclaimed by 26 June at the latest.

In Slovenia measures and activities have been taken whose aim is to establish an independent and autonomous state of Slovenia.

2. The Assembly of the Republic of Croatia has adopted the resolution of the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia on acceptance of the process of separation of the SFRY and on possible association in an alliance of sovereign republics. The Assembly of the Republic of Croatia has begun action on the adoption of new laws and other regulations with the aim of establishing a sovereign and independent state of Croatia.

3. Proceeding from the constitutional right of nations to self- determination to the point of secession, the FEC believes that the realization of this right constitutes a democratic process and not a unilateral act. This right can be realized only by joint agreement in a democratic process. The realization of this right also calls for a realistic recognition of the time factor. This means that there should be no interruption of the functioning of those parts of the system which are essential and whose dismantling objectively leads to a catastrophic economic, social and political situation. Dissociation, it is clear, may not produce negative and harmful consequences for the interets of the other republics and Yugoslavia as a whole, something the Federal Executive Council must and will take account of.

Secession as a unilateral act would mean a violent change of the current relations, that is, negation of democracy, that very right and the same right of other nations, that would lead to a violent settlement of the Yugoslav crisis.

4. The FEC holds that dissociation, if it occurs, can be realized only as a democratic process, that is, as a process of gradual independence and sovereignty, but also as a simultaneous advent of a fresh process which would consist of proposing and determing new relations between republics and nations, that is, new, modern integrational relations, such as those currently underway in Europe. This means that the fulfillment of this right should be directly linked with opening of processes of inevitable integration of Yugoslavia in the European integrational groups. The transformation of the existing system and content of economic and political relations, foreign affairs, and defense on a qualitatively new basis in terms of their time-scale, creates opportunities for the development of all sectors of the system and the system as a whole regarding the relation between local autonomy, republics, Yugoslavia, and Europe.

In this context it is necessary to find adequate normative and other solutions for the realization of the position of and guarantee for equal rights of all citizens in Yugoslavia, which means the same rights for minorities living in other republics, as well as for the guaranteeing and the protection of the rights of nationalities in each republic and autonomous province.

The FEC is prepared to fully involve itself in defining the process of forming a new system and new relations, and those parts of the system which are already clearly necessary and advanageous to all, as well as those which can be immediately autonomously resolved within each republic. All other issues which are not clear and cannot be defined at present should be left for future agreements and to allow time for the right answers to be found.

5. Proceeding from all the above—from the essential interests of the citizens of Yugoslavia, and particularly from the need to avoid the risk of serious conflicts and unnecessary casualties, from international commitments of the SFRY (the UN charter, the documents of the CSCE) that borders can only be changed by agreement, and similarly from the clearly expressed stands of the international community on the need to preserve Yugoslavia within its present borders—the FEC believes that agreements or unilateral decisions of any kind and by anyone on altering the external or internal border of the country run counter to the peaceful and democratic solution of the crisis, and as such must be considered illegal and unlawful. For such decisions the agreement of all the republics and nations of Yugoslavia is essential.

In the event of such a one-sided step as the expression of the policy of a fait accompli being taken, the FEC will, in order to protect the interests of parts of the country and of the country as a whole, take the necessary measures to ensure the required conditions for solving problems in a democratic way, through negotiations, and in this way open up the way for deep-seated transformations—in the interests of the nations, nationalities, and citizens of the SFRY.

IV

The FEC believes that the construction of a new economic, state, and political system offers scope for the establishment of the character and content of relations in the Yugoslav community on new democratic bases. It is in the interests of all citizens, nations, nationalities, and republics that Yugoslavia is defined as a community of sovereign republics and as a state organized in keeping with contemporary and democratic achievements in Europe and the world. The position of the autonomous provinces should also be adapted to these achievements.

1. The citizens and peoples of Yugoslavia and their republics would realize in this community, within existing borders, those of their common interests which are a condition for their general advancement and inclusion in European integration processes, and these are:

—The achievement and protection of the freedoms and rights of the individual and of citizens, as common and universal values of Europe and the world;

—in implementing the freedom of enterprise and spreading the scope for increasing economic efficiency, by the development of a market mechanism and the creation of conditions for the free flow of goods, capital, labor, and know-how throughout the area of Yugoslavia, which presupposes a uniform convertible currency and appropriate macroeconomic policy;

—the field of defense and security;

—the field of foreign policy; and

—the realization of other common interests which would be agreed separately.

In keeping with a definitive agreement on common interests—in other words, functions of the community—an agreement would also be reached concerning the organs of the community, the competence of which would be decided on so as to match the functions of the community. These organs should be independent in their work, be spread throughout the various parts of the country, and be independent of the influence of the organs of authority in the territory in which they are situated ("extra-territoriality").

2. Starting from these common interests, or rather functions, relations in the future community and the implementation of its functions would be based on the following basic principles:

1) The citizen, as an exponent of sovereignty, realizes his sovereign rights within the republic while specific functions are carried out at the level of the Yugoslav community;

2) the inviolability of private ownership, democracy in terms of ownership, and increasing the efficiency of business operations on this basis;

3) a parliamentary multiparty system;

4) the division of powers into legislative, judicial, and executive;

5) the full equality of people, nations, nationalities, and republics;

6) the guaranteeing and protection of the rights of nationalities and ethnic groups, in keeping with European and world standards in this field; and

7) the rule of law, in other words a law-governed state.

3. Supporting the platform on the future Yugoslav community, which the presidents of the republics, or presidents of the presidencies of the republics, accepted at their meeting in Sarajevo as a constructive basis for further work, and starting from the orientations concerning common interests, or rather the functions and basic principles of relations in the future community which have been set out, the FEC is ready, together with the republican and provincial executive councils, or governments, to form groups of experts which, starting from a critical assessment of present solutions in these fields and modern developments in Europe and the world, would carry out an identification and elaboration of those common interests which, as the functions of the future community, would be expressed in a constitutive act of the community.

In this way a basis would be created for representative bodies in the republics and provinces and the SFRY Assembly to be more actively involved in the process of finding solutions concerning the future system for the country. On this basis we should organize joint talks involving all constructive, all expertise in the country and find the best solutions. [sentence as heard]

1. Our current relations with the world show that the coming few days could be crucial for the future of Yugoslavia, as an integral part of a new Europe, or for our remaining on the margins of contemporary European and world developments.

Long-lasting political instability has led to a decline in the reputation of, and confidence in, Yugoslavia in the world. Yugoslavia has become a critical point, and a danger for peace and stability on the continent of Europe.

2. The internal crisis has caused set-backs in our relations with the world which will be difficult to make up for.

The international and legal status of the country as a subject has been destroyed because of behavior which is contrary to the country's established foreign policy, and because of the crisis in the SFRY Presidency; our links with the EC and other European communities have been halted; relations with international financial institutions have been frozen; and the influx of foreign capital and joint ventures have been blocked. The interest of foreign tourists has declined drastically and cooperation with the world in the fields of culture, education, science, and sport is being halted.

3. The EC, our other partners, and international financial institutions are showing full readiness to support Yugoslavia's inclusion in European integration, above all, by association with the EC.

It is particularly important that the process of association with the EC creates scope for the Yugoslav community to become an integral part of Europe, and its citizens to become citizens of Europe. The treaty on association provides on the world and European capital market a guarantee to business people that, behind their investments in Yugoslavia, on the basis of their interests, there also lie European guarantees—both political and economic. In this way Yugoslavia is given a great opportunity for development by the developed world, which

wants the peaceful and democratic unfurling of further processes in our country as well.

At the same time, there is concrete readiness to provide for our country significant financial support for the modernization and recovery of the Yugoslav economy, without which the great economic and social problems of our country cannot be overcome.

This implies the possibility that within a very short period we might secure significant financial resources on the basis of an agreement with the IMF, the IBRD, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and by the third protocol of the decision of the Paris Club concerning rescheduling the debts and loans of the EC, which would guarantee the full convertibility of the dinar.

The extent of the efforts being made by the world to show us the way problems should be solved is simply unbelievable—starting with the letter from President Bush, the telephone conversations with the EC, the visit by a delegation of the EC, by two of its most qualified people—the most qualified Mr. Jacques Delors and Mr. Jacques Santer; also the talks with leading statesmen of the world, with British Prime Minister John Major, with French President Francois Mitterrand, and with Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti; and also the messages which we have received from many sides and the talks with Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov; and at the last meeting of the CSCE and its message; and the message of the Twelve, and a series of messages which we have received and the readiness of the world to support us, because it is beginning to be seriously concerned about our future, but also about its own future. After all, the disruption in our country could lead to serious instability and dislocation in Europe and the world.

These messages which also go as far as to offer us material and financial support the like of which we could not even have expected, it seems, are not sinking in and are not getting through to some hotheads among some of the people in our country.

4. Securing this support is dependent on the urgent unblocking of our constitutional and political crisis. This is, moreover, also the message of the Declaration of the Twelve (Luxembourg, 8 June 1991), in which among other things the demand is made—or rather specified—that the normal transfer of the office of federal president, negotiations on future constitutional structures, the respect for human rights in all parts of the country, the intensification of the democratic process, as well as the continuation of the FEC's program of economic reforms in a united Yugoslavia, will make it possible for a new dimension to be imparted to relations between the [European] Community and Yugoslavia, in view of the traditional ties between them.

Such an approach, with support for Yugoslavia's territorial integrity and democratic transformation, was also expressed by all the countries participating in the CSCE in their statement of 19 June this year.

The overall situation in the country—economically, socially, and politically—which is very dramatic, will deteriorate further unless the interethnic and interrepublican conflicts end immediately. In a situation in which we have a net outflow of capital together with interest in 1991 alone of $4.8 billion, unless we have support from foreign countries, we are led toward complete erosion and collapse of manufacturing, to external and internal illiquidity, a shortage of goods, large-scale unemployment, and a drastic decline in the living standards of citizens in all parts of the country, with possible disturbances as a result of social and human traumas. All of this could end in such a degree of dissatisfaction that no one would be able to halt a social explosion. In this way civil, interethnic, and interrepublican war would become a real danger. Elimination of the political reasons for this situation by agreement will enable the system as a whole and in its parts to function. In addition to this, simply returning to the reforms and the policy of stabilization will represent a guarantee to the European and world community that we are prepared for and capable, in a democratic and peaceful way, of solving our own problems by ourselves. This is also the condition for obtaining financial and other international support, which will enable us not only to halt the complete erosion and disintegration of the system and the country, economic collapse and social poverty, but also to provide an essential stimulus to the new growth and development of all parts and the country as a whole, accompanied by a positive solution of the present economic, political, social, state, and interrepublican crises.

Respected delegates, I am sure that we are all thoroughly convinced that these are decisive and crucial moments for our country. The fate of perhaps several generations will depend on the steps taken by each of us and by each one who has an influence on the policy of the country, but also by each of our citizens. No one has the right to abuse his power and provoke consequences which for a very long time to come will affect millions of our people. In order to change the achievements resulting from the aspirations and efforts of many generations and intellectuals, over a period of more than one century, many democratic talks are needed, because it is only in this way that the expression of wisdom comes about. Unless this happens, we risk only violence.

It is not a matter of whether we want radical changes—and in keeping with the new aspirations and contemporary ranges of democracy—human freedoms and modern business operations in Europe and the world. This FEC has been subordinating its programs and work precisely to this goal during the whole of its period in office.

It is a matter of what the is the realistic and democratic way of our achieving this.

Our views and proposals as to how we achieve this so that it serves the prosperity and happiness of everyone and at the same time the trust of the international

community in Yugoslavia, and thus also in all of us, without which no one has a reliable future, are contained in what I have just set out.

By coincidence today, you see, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker is in Yugoslavia. Also staying [in Yugoslavia] today is the director-general of the new European bank for the support of development in former socialist countries. They also brought us many messages. We accept these messages.

Let us put on one side emotions, sensitivity, and misconceptions. This is a moment of decision which requires that we raise ourselves above everything, as we have known how to do many times in the past, and can do it today. Thank you.

Markovic Calls For Peaceful Settlement

LD2106164791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1543 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 21 (TANJUG)—Prime Minister Ante Markovic today voiced a dramatic call for a peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav crisis, warning that the federal authorities would consider illegal all unilateral decisions changing the external or internal borders of the country.

"Let us leave aside emotions and delusions. This is the time for a decision which impels us to rise above everything, as we did so many times in the past" Markovic told the Federal parliament, explaining the government proposals for settling the crisis and putting in order relations in the Yugoslav community.

In case of someone deciding unilaterally on changing Yugoslavia's internal or external borders, he said, the "Federal Government will take the necessary measures to provide the conditions for dealing with the problems democratically."

The prime minister called for lifting all obstacles which upset the unity of the Yugoslav market, adopting this year's budget of the federation, protecting the savings of citizens, adopting real social programmes, and ensuring money—without which the fall in production cannot be stopped—especially from foreign sources.

Markovic said that it was essential to "lift at once the blockade in the Presidency of Yugoslavia by proclaiming its president and vice president, under the country's Constitution and according to the order exstablished by the Presidency's rules of procedure."

He also called for "removing the blockade in the Yugoslav parliament" and stopping the "marginalization of parliament in dealing with the Yugoslav crisis."

It is essential to reach agreement on the holding of multiparty elections for the Federal Chamber (of Yugoslavia's bicameral parliament) and on elections for the parliament's Chamber of the Republics and Provinces in the provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina (which are part of the republic of Serbia), said Markovic.

No violation of border trade or any appropriation of tariffs and duties as the prime source of income of the federation will be allowed, he specified.

Slovenia announced that it would respect its financial obligations towards the federation only until the proclamation of independence on June 26.

Until agreement on the country's future is reached, the Federal Government will most energetically use all legal means to oppose unilateral demands and behaviour, as well as hegemony and imposing one's will on others, said Markovic.

It is necessary to prevent a deterioration of inter-ethnic relations in all republics, to ensure security of the individual and his property and to deal with problems primarily by legal means, he said. Markovic added that arms must be confiscated from those who illegally acquired them and that all illegal armed groups must be disarmed and disbanded.

As for Kosovo, said Markovic, topical problems must be urgently tackled by democratic means and conditions created for the restoration of the normal functioning of competent bodies.

Speaking about the announced dissociation (from Yugoslavia) of the republics of Slovenia and Croatia, Markovic said the federal government maintains that exercising the right to self-determination is a democratic process and not a unilateral act.

Dissociation must not adversely affect the interests of other republics and Yugoslavia as a whole, he stressed.

Markovic said that dissociation, should it come about, can only be implemented as a democratic process and that it should be linked directly to the opening of the process of inevitable joining of European integration groupings. Dissociation as a unilateral act would only mean a forceful change in the existing relations, he added.

The federal prime minister said it was in the interest of all citizens, nations, ethnic groups and republics that Yugoslavia be defined as a community of sovereign republics and as a state organized in accordance with modern and democratic achievements. The position of the autonomous provinces should be adjusted to these achievements, he added.

A community of sovereign republics would take care about the protection of human rights and freedoms, the freedom of entrepreneurship and the spreading of possibilities for greater economic efficiency, defence and security, foreign policy and other common interests, said Markovic.

Agreement would also be reached about the community's organs, to be located in various parts of the country and independent in their work, he added.

In the future community, the citizen would be the protagonist of sovereignty and would exercise his rights in the republic, while some functions should be performed at the Yugoslav level, said Markovic.

Private property would be sacrosant, parliament would be a multiparty one, power would be divided into legislative, judicial and executive, and people, the nations, ethnic groups and republics would be equal, he added.

Markovic went on to say that the federal government was prepared to set up, together with the republican and provincial governments, groups of experts to indentify those common interests which, as a function of the future community, would be expressed in its constitutive act.

Noting that influential European and global factors assess that Yugoslavia is threatened with a civil war which, in addition to serious consequences at the internal level, could lead to serious instability and conflicts in the region and even in Europe, Markovic said that the coming days may be crucial for the future of Yugoslavia as an integral part of new Europe.

The European Community and international financial institutions are fully prepared to accept Yugoslavia's joining in European integrations, primarily through an association with the European Community, he said.

There is concrete evidence of the readiness to render Yugoslavia significant financial assistance, said Markovic, but this depends on the resolving of the constitutional and political crisis in the country.

Yugoslavia needs financial aid because the outflow of net capital and interest will amount to 4.8 billion dollars this year alone, the prime minister said.

In conclusion, Markovic noted that the fate of perhaps several generations depends on the steps taken by everyone who influences the country's policy, but also on every citizen. "Nobody has the right to abuse his power and cause consequences which will for affect millions of people in Yugoslavia for a long, long time."

Markovic Appeals for Peaceful End to Crisis

LD2106141791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1327 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 21 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic today made a dramatic appeal for the peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav crisis, warning at the same time that the Federal authorities would consider as "illegal" all unilateral decisions on changing the country's internal and external borders.

"This is the moment of decision which requires that we rise above the situation, as we have done so many times in the past," Markovic said in the Federal parliament today, setting out the government's proposal for resolving the crisis and settling the relations in the Yugoslav community.

"The future of perhaps several generations depends on the steps each one of us takes, of everyone who can influence the country's policy, including that of each of our citizens", Markovic said.

He added that "no one has the right to abuse his authority and provoke consequences which will affect millions of our people for a very long time".

Markovic underscored that if "unilateral steps" to change the existing borders are taken, the government would "for the protection of interests of parts and of the country as a whole, take measures which will secure necessary conditions for the settlement of problems democratically, through negotiations ..."

Proposing negotiations which would "define Yugoslavia as a community of sovereign republics organized in keeping with modern and democratic achievements in Europe and the world", the Federal prime minister noted, among other things, the possibility of re-locating certain federal institutions to different parts of the country.

Markovic Warns of 'Disintegration' of Society

LD2406093391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0904 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 24 Jun (TANJUG)—"Interruptions in reforms and transformations in our society are occurring primarily, and I would say, exclusively, for political reasons," said Federal Executive Council [FEC] President Ante Markovic in reply to his own question as to what has been happening in Yugoslavia over the last nine months.

Speaking in Zagreb today to deputies of the Croatian Assembly, Markovic warned that "instead of transformations, there is disintegration of our society, and as a result, we are in a situation that will take us back to where we were many years ago. At present we are in fact in a situation that is economically, socially, and politically no different from that in other Eastern European countries despite the fact that the potentials we created are still available." According to Markovic, these potentials, if accompanied by a return to the programs of reforms and democratization of our society, are such that they would enable us not just to restore the exceptionally successful period of transformations but also again to overtake all other Eastern European countries and to pave the way for securing our place among west European democracies and their organizations.

Says Cost 'Enormous'

LD2406102491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0921 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 24 Jun (TANJUG)—Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic said in the Croatian Assembly today that the question to ask is whether all that is facing us today—and which the Assembly is expected to decide on—is an act of the transformation of one system into another, which is expected to develop and find its place in the democratically developed world of western Europe, or whether the present system will have to be destroyed to build a new one.

All of our calculations indicate that the difference in the cost, not just from the economic and social aspects but also the human aspect, would be enormous. If we are to continue along that path we shall find ourselves in the situation we were in years ago. This could result in economic and social relations fraught with the threat of social explosion, Markovic stressed.

Markovic: Bosnian Developments Will Decide Fate

LD2406104291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0951 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 24 Jun (TANJUG)—Speaking in the Croatian Assembly today Ante Markovic said that from the very beginning he has maintained that the fate of our country and relations in it would be decided in Bosnia-Hercegovina. The attitude to Bosnia-Hercegovina as a sovereign entity within Yugoslavia cannot be the result of agreements or negotiations and divisions, he stressed.

The attitude to Bosnia-Hercegovina will be an indication of whether relations in our country will be resolved through violence, conflicts, and even military interventions or whether we shall resolve them in a more democratic way in which our society will be transformed into another, Markovic said.

Republican Leaders Hold Talks With Baker

LD2106220591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1610 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 21 Jun (TANJUG)—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker began a series of separate talks today in the Federation Palace in Belgrade with the presidents of the republican presidencies. The outcome will be known at the conclusion of the talks; Baker himself hinted that he had a different message for each of the republican leaders.

In his talks with the president of Macedonia, Kiro Gligorov, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker reiterated and pointed out, in a more pronounced and specific way than the CSCE did in Berlin, that he favored the preservation of Yugoslavia's integrity and unity and that this is very important for ensuring the peace and reforms in the country.

In his brief conversation with the media, Gligirov said that he had acquainted the head of the U.S. diplomatic service with the proposal of Macedonia and Bosnia-Hercegovina for solving the crisis in Yugoslavia and for Yugoslavia's future structure. Baker said, Gligirov stressed, that "it seems to him that this platform is reasonable and that he agrees with it." [TANJUG punctuation]

In his talks with Gligorov, James Baker pointed out three fundamental principles regarding Yugoslavia: democracy, human rights, and respect for national minorities and economic reforms. In his words, it is necessary for Yugoslavia to solve, as soon as possible, the problem that has emerged in the state Presidency, continue its democratic reforms, and call elections for the Federal Chamber of the SFRY Assembly.

The U.S. secretary of state said he is not speaking just on his own behalf in Belgrade. In this context, he recalled his talks with some of Yugoslavia's neighbors, as well as with representatives of the European Community, during the course of the CSCE ministerial summit in Berlin. All of them, as Baker put it, support Yugoslavia's integrity, democratic reforms, and a peaceful solution to the Yugoslavia crisis.

Momir Bulatovic, president of the Presidency of Montenegro, stated, after his 30-minute talk with the U.S. secretary of state, that Mr. Baker's logic is very sound and acceptable.

I am grateful to Mr. Baker for his interest and support for those aims, that inevitability amount to resolving the Yugoslav crisis in a peaceful and democratic way without jeopardizing the country's unity and integrity in the process. Bulatovic added that, at any rate, it is too early to draw any conclusions. I hope that in those areas where we did not share the same opinions, I managed to present arguments that made Mr. Baker think to the extent that his arguments made me think.

In Bulatovic's words, differences of opinion were revealed by the question of how and in what way one is to start resolving the Yugoslav crisis. Should we begin with the election of Mesic to the post of president of the SFRY Presidency, or should some other preconditions be met prior to that?

Bulatovic said that he advocated the second option, reasoning that the moment it has been made unambiguously clear that Yugoslavia's unity and integrity will be respected, there will be, at least as far as his reasoning is concerned, no obstacles to Mesic becoming president of the SFRY Presidency.

The overall developments in Yugoslavia have deeply discouraged me, Bulatovic said. I am afraid, he added, that Yugoslavia is on the brink of an economic war of great proportions and that the initial signal will be flashed by the Slovene Assembly on 26 June. Money has always been the most powerful weapon. In the past, real weapons have often been deployed because of it.

I believe, however, that a solution can be found. Its essence is, Bulatovic maintains, whether we are willing to live in one country for a transitional period of five years and devise methods to live together.

In Bulatovic's words, Serbia and Montenegro have embraced the Izetbegovic-Gligorov platform. The sovereignty of the republic is no longer disputable, but the character of the community is. The moment it has been declared that the sovereign republics make up one state community with loose links and communications, we will take a big step toward getting out of the Yugoslav crisis.

The six republican presidents, Bulatovic says, are not capable negotiators. If this is not true, they would already have reached an agreement. Vastly differing interests are at stake. We are all, he said, captives of our own policies. Momir Bulatovic concluded that the step toward the compromise should now be taken, but by Kucan and Tudjman.

In his talk with Slovene President Milan Kucan, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker said clearly and specifically: Neither the United States nor anyone else will recognize Slovenia's status as an international subject.

Milan Kucan replied to this very direct statement: "The very autonomy of Slovenia will be a new circumstance, something that should mean that the world's conduct will be different under these new circumstances."

The Baker-Kucan meeting lasted 45 minutes, 15 minutes longer than the scheduled time. It appears that this seemingly insignificant detail says a great deal about the United State's concern for what may happen on 26 June, following Slovenia's secession.

Baker specifically insisted that Slovenia's dissociation from Yugoslavia should not create violence in the country. Kucan claims that there is already violence in Yugoslavia and that all Slovenia's moves have so far been, as he put it, aimed at solving the crisis in the country peacefully.

In his brief talk with journalists, Kucan was also asked to remark on how Baker had understood the linguistic conundrums of secession versus dissocation. Kucan said that Baker had not dwelled on linguistics, as he had been solely interested in the essential issues. In the Slovene president's words, dissociation does not automatically mean an end to any notion of a shared future, since the Yugoslav independent states can only stay together along pragmatic rather than ideological lines.

The office of Slobodan Milosevic, president of the Republic of Serbia, announced that he had familiarized U.S. Secretary of State James Baker with the well-known stances and views of the Republic of Serbia on the resolution of the Yugoslav crisis. He stressed that Serbia advocates the preservation of Yugoslavia as the common, democratic state of equal Yugoslav nations and republics, whose competent authority will lie in the ensuring of a unified market, in the protection of the freedom and rights of the individual and of citizens throughout its territory, and in ensuring functions in the fields of defense and foreign policy.

The Republic of Serbia, Milosevic stressed, believes that a peaceful and democratic outcome to the Yugoslav crisis can be achieved, provided that changes are carried out in a legal way, in accordance with the procedure envisaged for changing the constitution of Yugoslavia. A proviso is that Yugoslavia is not abolished and does not cease to exist, in terms of its international and legal status and in terms of its continuity.

Secretary of State James Baker expressed support for the territorial integrity and indivisibility of Yugoslavia, stressing that, in the view of the U.S. Government, this is a condition for the development of democracy, a market economy, and respect for human rights.

The same statement also said that the U.S. Government wishes to continue the development of cooperation and relations with Yugoslavia as a whole. Secretary of State Baker pointed out that the solution for finding a way out of the Yugoslav crisis should be sought through dialogue. He agreed with the assessment that a peaceful and democratic outcome of the crisis could be arrived at only by respecting legality.

It was announced that there was also discussion of the issue of Kosovo and Metohija, as well as of the resolution of the crisis in the SFRY Presidency.

Surrounded by numerous journalists in the hall of the Palace of the Federation in Novi Beograd, Slobodan Milosevic, president of the Republic of Serbia, stated that the talks were very open and very constructive, following his half hour of talks with the U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

We greatly appreciate the standpoint of our collocutor who, as is well known, has a very positive attitude toward the integrity of the country. This, as you all know, Milosevic added, is the most important thing at this point in time.

As to whether he believes that these talks will help to resolve the Yugoslav crisis, Milosevic replied that he believes that every well-intentioned influence that could help us to resolve our problems together by ourselves could certainly represent a contribution.

Asked what was meant by his flexibility having certain limits, Milosevic stressed that his flexibility is limited by the survival of the country and the interests of its peoples. There certainly cannot be flexibility beyond these limits, and no one expects this from us.

One journalist's reaction was that the theory of limited sovereignty was known to us. Mr. Kucan says that it is a matter of inflexibility. Milosevic countered with a question: Whose inflexibility?

To the statement that it is Milosevic's inflexibility, Milosevic replied: As you have seen, we are very happy to support the compromise formula that was proposed. It remains for others to stick to this proposal.

"I never said that Croatia would secede, and I did not say it to U.S. Secretary of State Baker either. Some others—those who would want to remain—want its secession. I told Baker that we would declare full sovereignty and autonomy and that after dissociation, which is sometimes a long and sometimes a short process, we would propose talks on the possibility of the creation of a community of sovereign republics."

President of Croatia Franjo Tudjman stated this today immediately after his talks with U.S. Secretary of State Baker. According to Tudjman, Baker expressed the view of the United States and the EC concerning the present moment in Yugoslavia. There are similarities and differences. The similarities lie in the acceptance of generally known democratic principles—human rights, legislative democracy, respect for the rights of national minorities, respect for the will of nations, and opposition to the use of force in the resolution of the crisis. The basic difference lies in the fact that the United States and the EC would not want the disintegration of Yugoslavia, but would want Yugoslavia to be preserved. "Our referendum makes dissociation binding, and within the course of this month," Tudjman said.

Baker, Tudjman stated, said that the United States and the EC are interested in a democratic resolution of the Yugoslav crisis and also in preventing civil war. In Tudjman's view, Baker, as well as the world's public, is obsessed with the fear of civil war. Tudjman told Baker that, although some such danger exists, this "has always been exaggerated by those circles who have been against a democratic transformation or who want to impose their own solutions, for which they do not have political support."

Mr. Baker surprised me with his knowledge of the situation in Yugoslavia. However, it does not seem to me that in his talks today any significant results were achieved. Alija Izetbegovic, president of the Presidency of Bosnia-Hercegovina, stated this following his meeting with the U.S. Secretary of State this evening.

According to Izetbegovic, Baker clearly perceived where the influence of the United States could be used. Baker obviously considers that Croatia and Slovenia should be persuaded to extend their talks on the future of Yugoslavia, regardless of their declarations of independence. On the other hand, he believes that influence should be exerted on Serbia and Montenegro so that the crisis in the SFRY Presidency is resolved as quickly as possible, in keeping with the constitution and regulations concerning its operation.

Baker, Izetbegovic went on, also raised a series of questions about Bosnia-Hercegovina, referring to the possibility of civil war. I told him, the president of the Presidency of Bosnia-Hercegovina added, that if we were unfortunate enough to have an outbreak of civil war, then this would occur in Bosnia-Hercegovina. The only certain way to prevent this, Izetbegovic believes, is to maintain a Yugoslav community in which the interests of the republics would be guaranteed. If this is not done, the secessions that would possibly result could have an impact on Bosnia-Hercegovina and lead to clashes that might be transferred to Yugoslavia, and also to crisis hotspots in Europe.

Izetbegovic stressed that Baker [was] informed of the compromise proposal by the presidents of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia. The U.S. secretary of state spoke in most favorable terms about the proposal because, Izetbegovic said, Baker sees Yugoslavia in the future just as it has been defined in the compromise proposal.

Asked whether he had spoken with Baker in his capacity as a Muslim leader or as president of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency, since this republic's Serbs grant legitimacy to Slobodan Milosevic, Izetbegovic said that this granting of legitimacy is illegitimate. I spoke in my capacity as president of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency.

Commenting on the pronounced willingness of Serbia and Montenegro to accept the compromise platform for solving the Yugoslav crisis, Izetbegovic said that everyone reads it as they see fit. If it is to be accepted, one should make it clear that the future Yugoslav community will be an alliance of sovereign republics, creating a community with the characteristics of a state. Whether Slobodan Milosevic and Momir Bulatovic read this platform in this way, I am not sure, but I am glad that they are becoming inclined to it, as there is meaning in that.

When asked how Bosnia-Hercegovina will react to the decisions of Croatia and Slovenia, Izetbegovic expressed his hope that at least for the time being they will be just proclamations that would not be followed by severing links with Yugoslavia. According to Izetbegovic, these proclamations do not prevent further negotiations on the future of Yugoslavia. However, we would have a serious situation if communications were severed. In the first case, Bosnia-Hercegovina would not have to voice its stand immediately, but in the second case it would. How? This is a very difficult question, perhaps the most difficult one in my life, Izetbegovic said.

Where and how? The citizens of Bosnia-Hercegovina would have to hold a referendum. Such a decision cannot be made on their behalf by any body in the republic, not even by the assembly, Alija Izetbegovic concluded.

TANJUG Notes Baker's 'Gloomy' Departure

LD2206082591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Services in Serbo-Croatian 0708 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Excerpt] Belgrade, 22 Jun (TANJUG)—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker left Belgrade for Tirana this

morning following his one-day visit to Yugoslavia. As he stated last night, he would be leaving Belgrade with "sustained optimism" following a series of talks with Prime Minister Markovic, Federal Foreign Affairs Secretary Budimir Loncar, and the six republican leaders. However, sources close to the U.S. delegation stress that Baker left Yugoslavia in a mood more gloomy than when he arrived. [passage omitted]

Baker Meets With Kosovo Albanians in Belgrade

LD2106163191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1505 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 21 Jun (TANJUG)—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker met in Belgrade today with representatives of the opposition movements of Albanians from Kosovo: Ibrahim Rugova, leader of the Democratic Alliance; Veton Surroi, president of the Parliamentarian Party; and Adem Demaci, president of the Committee for the Protection of Human Rights.

In his brief statement to TANJUG, Veton Surroi described as "fairly successful" the 25-minute meeting, which was held behind closed doors in Belgrade's Hyatt Regency Hotel.

In his words, support was given to the Albanian opposition's efforts to ensure that "human rights are respected and that Yugoslavia's integrity and the will of all citizens, including the will of Albanians, is respected."

"We noted that we would always strive to find a peaceful way to resolve conflicts and to fully respect legality," Surroi added.

"We also pointed out that there could be no minorities in Yugoslavia because there is no majority, and it could only be a community of citizens and collectives on equal terms," he concluded.

Surroi also told TANJUG that the meeting was held on the initiative of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

Statement Issued on Baker-Milosevic Talks

AU2106182591 Belgrade RTV Sat TV in Serbo-Croatian 1730 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Announcer-read statement issued on Milosevic-Baker talks held in Belgrade on 21 June]

[Text] President Milosevic briefed Secretary of State Baker on Serbia's stands on the solution of the Yugoslav crisis stressing that Serbia strives for the preservation of Yugoslavia as a joint democratic state of equal Yugoslav peoples and republics whose responsibilities will be to secure conditions for a unified market, the protection of the freedoms and rights of people and citizens on the entire territory, as well as functions in the fields of defense and foreign policy.

The Republic of Serbia takes the view that a peaceful and democratic solution can be achieved if the changes are carried out in accordance with the procedure envisaged for amending the Constitution provided that Yugoslavia is not abolished and does not cease to exist in its international legal continuity.

Secretary of State Baker expressed support for the territorial integrity and entirety of Yugoslavia, stressing that in the view of the U.S. Administration this is the condition for the development of democracy, a market economy, and the respect of human rights.

The U.S. Administration, the statement points out, wants to continue the development of cooperation with Yugoslavia as a whole, and holds the view that the denouement of the crisis can only be achieved by respecting the law.

During their talks, Milosevic and Baker discussed questions concerning Kosovo and Metohija and the solution of the crisis in the SFRY Presidency.

Baker Views Talks 'Very Successful'

LD2106142891 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1253 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 21 Jun (TANJUG)—We support the democratization, protection of human rights, territorial integrity, and preservation of the unity of Yugoslavia. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker stated this at the conclusion of his talks this morning with Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic and Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Budimir Loncar, talks that lasted for an hour and a half.

During a short news conference with Yugoslav and foreign journalists in the hall of the Palace of the Federation in New Belgrade, the U.S. secretary of state referred to the talks with Markovic and Loncar as "very, very successful".

We have made it quite clear, Baker stressed, that the United States wants to assist, inasmuch as it can, in the democratization of Yugoslavia, the protection of human rights, and the preservation of the country's unity. We believe that the possibilities for dialogue in Yugoslavia are not exhausted, and we hope that the Federal and republican government will have opportunities to resolve the problems through negotiation, Baker said.

Press on Presidency's Failure To Hold Session

LD2106143391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1150 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 21 (TANJUG)—On the failure to hold the session of the Yugoslav State Presidency yesterday, the Belgrade daily BORBA today writes that the "Yugoslav political and economic crisis was plunging into new abysses" and that the collective head of state has "probably sung its swan song".

"This, of course, still does not mean that Yugoslavia will break apart if the Presidency falls apart. But, really, it is not right, not political, it is immoral that the collective head of state drags the country into chaos", BORBA points out.

The session of the collective head of state, scheduled at the initiative of Vasil Tupurkovski, the Macedonian representative in the Presidency, was not held because the representatives of the Republics of Slovenia and Croatia, Janez Drnovsek and Stjepan Mesic, did not show up.

Their explanation was that "on the basis of talks in Belgrade, they were under the impression that, at the moment, there was no readiness to unblock the Yugoslav Presidency".

The work of the Presidency was blocked because the representative of Croatia, Stjepan Mesic, was not elected president, under a regular system of rotation, at the May 15 session. Mesic needed five members of the eight-man Presidency to vote for him.

The Zagreb daily VJESNIK, close to the Croatian leadership, today writes about the "imperative of naming Stipe Mesic as the first among equals in the Presidency", which has "international implications".

"The torpedoing of the routine change in the Presidency can only satisfy those who are willing to save, or more precisely, prolong the definite breakdown of the existing order in Yugoslavia", VJESNIK writes.

The Belgrade daily POLITIKA, close to the leadership of the republic of Serbia, today writes that "chances for the continuation of the session of the Yugoslav Presidency, which would be attended by all members, were very slim".

POLITIKA has also "unofficially learned" that "a number of important conclusions were reached" at yesterday's working meeting of the six members of the Presidency (without Mesic and Drnovsek), so that the rump collective head of state continues to function.

The Sarajevo daily OSLOBODJENJE, Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, assesses that the Yugoslav Presidency "is not managing to get out of the labyrinth in which it got lost owing to its own carelessness", adding that "it is possible that the majority do not want to look for a way out".

OSLOBODJENJE points out that this is "extremely dangerous when the assemblies of two republics are taking concrete steps towards dissociation, when Croatia and Slovenia are passing laws on quitting Yugoslavia".

The Federal Chamber of the Yugoslav parliament yesterday unanimously adopted conclusions which oblige the Presidency to elect its president and vice-president under the constitution and its book of rules by June 25.

In a statement to the Belgrade daily VECERNJE NOVOSTI, Yugoslav Presidency member from Montenegro Branko Kostic disputed the legitimacy of the Federal Chamber of the Yugoslav parliament.

"I would like to recall that we, the members of the Yugoslav Presidency, have been elected legitimately which cannot be said for the delegates in the Federal Chamber because they have already extended their mandates three times", Kostic said.

Army Reportedly Supports Democratic Changes

LD2106175891 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1613 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Sarajevo, 21 Jun (TANJUG)—Colonel General Veljko Kadijevic, federal secretary for national defense, and his aides today made a routine inspection of the First Military District's units of the Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] which set up a camp in Kupresko Polje. After being acquainted with their working and living conditions and observing their scheduled exercises General Kadijevic praised the soldiers and officers for their conscientious work and responsible execution of the duties they were charged with and their high level of skill enabling them to operate in all conditions.

The federal secretary for national defense also talked with the most responsible officers of the First Military District. Speaking about the assertion of the JNA's position and role in the development of the Yugoslav crisis, General Kadijevic said, among other things:

"We shall do our best to help the transformation of Yugoslav society to be implemented by agreement, without interethnic armed confrontations, and in a peaceful and democratic way. Let no one delude themselves into believing that they will be able to do away with Yugoslavia and break its territorial integrity by a policy of fait accompli and unilateral actions," Kadijevic stressed.

During this visit the federal secretary for national defense was being accompanied by the commander of the First Military District, Colonel General Aleksandar Spirovski.

Slovenia, Croatia To Declare Independence Jointly

LD2306183391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1730 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 23 Jun (TANJUG)—Croatia together with Slovenia will declare independence, Slovene President Milan Kucan said in an interview to the newly formed Slovene news agency STA.

Kucan said that this is a coordinated move on the part of both republics at the institutional and legal level, while the given circumstances, which may differ, will dictate how they will assert their sovereignty and the pace of implementing their legislation in practice. The two republics, Kucan said, will cooperate in those areas

where they have shared interests, one of their principal interests being their joint approach toward the process of making both republics independent.

Asked about "the danger of a conflict with the Yugoslav Peoples' Army," Milan Kucan said, according to the STA agency, that "conflicts with the army can always occur if the pretext for this is based on the notion that Slovenia gained its independence through unilateral actions that infringe upon the interests and rights of the other republics. Such explanations are always possible because they tend to forget our offers over the past six months in the wake of the plebiscite that has been met with no response...."

Slovene, Croatian Presidents View Dissociation

LD2206203991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1919 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 22 Jun (TANJUG)—We are inviting the other republics, because we are willing to create an alliance with all those republics that accept the general principles of human and civil rights and the people's right to self-determination and the rights of national minorities, the general principles modern European society is based upon. This was said by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman to Croatian Television following his meeting today with Slovene President Milan Kucan.

At this meeting in Zagreb, the circumstances were examined in which these two Yugoslav republics "have set in motion the process of dissociation from the other republics and association along new lines," according to a statement from the closed meeting.

The presidents of Slovenia and Croatia received only one television reporter of Croatian Television and answered two questions. Tudjman and Kucan said that today's meeting was the last one between two top-level republican delegations prior to the implementation of the Croatian referendum decision and the Slovene plebiscite. They said that joint decisions were made in Zagreb.

"The dissociation decisions that we will make in Slovenia and Croatia will be a further step toward democratization and the consolidation of not only our sovereignty but of our democratic order, too, and a contribution to the resolution of Yugoslavia's state crisis, because, along with our decision to seek independence and to start and continue the process of dissociation that has already been in evidence, we are also at the same time addressing our message to the other republics that we are willing to create an alliance with them," Tudjman said. "This is our contribution to the resolution of the Yugoslav crisis and our invitation to the other republics to create, if they want to, an alliance or community of sovereign republics on this soil," he concluded.

Asked about the results of U.S. Secretary of State Baker's visit to Yugoslavia, Tudjman briefly elaborated that "Baker spoke in favor of Yugoslavia's integrity, but he was also of the opinion that the entire democratic world would recognize the will of a nation". "The recognition of Slovenia and Croatia will nevertheless be less painful than was the recognition of some other states."

Kucan voiced pessimism following his talks with Baker, but he nevertheless said that Slovenia would carry on with the process of dissociation. "Baker was very specific regarding the recognition of Slovenia by saying the United States and Europe would not recognize a seceded Slovenia," Kucan said. The Slovene president blamed Yugoslav diplomats for the U.S. attitude by saying: "What kind of truth about Yugoslavia is being disseminated throughout the world by the federal administration?" Kucan concluded, however, that Slovenia is going to have problems with no international recognition, but "in the end the world will react in a pragmatic way and recognize Slovenia as soon as it manages to implement its sovereignty in a peaceful and democratic way without threatening the peace and interests of the international community."

Reaction From Army Not Expected

AU2106141491 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] The festive proclamation of independent and sovereign Slovenia will take place on 26 June at 2030. This was stated by the Slovene Secretary for Information Jelko Kacin at a news conference in Ljubljana.

(?Answering the question) whether he expects a reaction from the Yugoslav People's Army on the same day, Janez Jansa, the republican secretary for national defense, said that he did not expect one, although appropriate security measures had been taken.

Peterle Views Secession, National Borders

AU2206201691 Belgrade RTV Sat TV in Serbo-Croatian 1730 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Interview with Slovene Prime Minister Lojze Peterle in Ljubljana, by anchorman Mihajlo Kovac, in Belgrade—live]

[Text] [Kovac] Our guest on this news program is also the president of the Slovene Government, Lojze Peterle. Until yesterday perhaps... [changes thought] I would like to ask you to explain whether Slovenia is seceding, dissociating, becoming independent, or only wants to achieve a higher level of sovereignty. I must admit that when I saw public works scenes on erecting border posts on the border with Croatia, I became almost convinced that you are finally and definitely going for secession. Am I correct, and can you briefly say what Slovenia will look like on 27 June, the day after secession?

[Peterle] [in Slovene with superimposed Serbo-Croatian translation] Thank you for raising this question. First, I

would like to say that if Slovenia wanted to secede, it would have done it several months ago when the conditions for this were much better. We already wanted to be independent then. This is what we want to achieve, via dissociation. We informed other republics and federal institutions about that. Unfortunately, we did not find anyone to talk to, anyone who would really respect our wish and our political aim that was confirmed by the Slovene plebiscite. Now, the day—which has already been known for six months—when Slovenia will become independent is closer and closer.

What will 27 June look like? In fact, very little will change internally. Even the things that were filmed on the Croat-Slovene border are only the internal expression of changes in the formal situation. It is certain that this border will be very informal, according to European standards. People will cross it without any difficulties.

Regarding the effective assumption of the areas designated in the 13 laws that were adopted by the Slovene Assembly, one should draw one's attention to the questions of customs, the National Bank of Slovenia, and many other things that will formally be transferred to Slovenia's hands, although this will not affect life very much.

The fact that formal changes will take place and that there will be effective assumption of some elements and areas does not mean that Slovenia will cease to be ready for negotiations about the future union of sovereign states within the present Yugoslavia. In this sense, I do not see any changes in physical borders.

[Kovac] In view of your intensive international activities in the last few months, allow me to remind you of a fact which you are probably more familiar with than I am, namely the fact, especially after the CSCE meeting in Berlin, that the international public, above all the European public, does not—I would say almost by plebiscite—accept the idea of the unilateral departure from Yugoslavia or changes in Yugoslavia's borders.

[Peterle] As regards the Berlin conference, there are different interpretations, especially regarding borders and the unity of Yugoslavia. We see the future formula of Yugoslavia, which we are not against, only as a union of sovereign states. In this sense, the name of Yugoslavia will continue to serve and we do not foresee physical alterations of borders. However, there will be changes in the status of the republics within present borders.

[Kovac] Will Slovenia change only its status on 27 June in relation to the rest of Yugoslavia? In other words, will it remain within the framework of Yugoslavia's state borders as a new political, economic, or legal entity or not?

[Peterle] This is a very important question and we are aware of it. If one constituent part of the present Yugoslav Federation changes its formal status and proclaims state sovereignty, this in a way changes the formal-legal status of the entire federation. This leads to the results that should be respected in the sense of the succession of a state within the entire political arena.

[Kovac] Finally, Mr. Peterle, one very personal question. If I happened to have relatives in Slovenia or a business reason to travel to Ljubljana or some other city in Slovenia, after 26 June would I have to bring my Yugoslav passport with me to enter your state?

[Peterle] It will be sufficient to have only a personal identification document. Nothing particularly extraordinary will happen on the border. You will be welcome as a dear guest as has been the case up to now. No one will stop you or anyone else who is coming with good intentions.

[Kovac] Thank you for the invitation, Mr. Peterle; but I must admit that, after all, I would feel it to be somehow unpleasant to go to Slovenia via a border crossing even if I only needed an identity card.

Slovene Presidency Responds to Loncar Speech

AU2106151891 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1330 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] At today's session of the Slovene Presidency, which was also attended by Dr. France Bucar, president of the Slovene Assembly, and republican secretaries Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, Igor Bavcar, and Janez Jansa, the Presidency took a stand on the reply made by Yugoslav Foreign Minister Budimir Loncar at the CSCE foreign ministers' meeting in Berlin that has taken place over the past two days.

In the statement, the Slovene Presidency denied any responsibility for Yugoslavia's disintegration. In his Berlin speech, Loncar blamed Slovenia and the other republics that wish to become independent states. Loncar claimed that the existence of several independent states would also be a time bomb in the heart of Europe. The Slovene Presidency pointed out that stability on Yugoslav territory can only be ensured through radical changes in mutual relations in Yugoslavia.

Undoubtedly, Slovenia has been striving for stability on Yugoslav territory over a long period. For this reason it has offered, jointly with the Republic of Croatia, a proposal for a confederal structure. Regarding the mutual conflicts between independent states that Loncar forecasted, the statement from today's session of the Slovene Presidency emphasizes that such conflictual conditions in Yugoslavia have been caused by unjust and undemocratic structures and practice in Yugoslavia.

It is a fact that, in the past, the Yugoslav nations have lived in different countries, but nevertheless continued to have friendly mutual relations. Slovenia also completely rejects the unjustified and superficial view that it is not democratic and does not qualify to be part of Europe. The truth is quite the opposite.

The Slovene Presidency also concludes that the behavior of Mr. Loncar and the Federal Secretariat for Foreign

Affairs is not based on facts and that Loncar did not even try to get the opinion and approval of the Republic of Slovenia for his speech. If this had been the case, the Slovene Presidency would have firmly opposed the ideas advocated by Minister Loncar.

Presidency Protests Army Removal of Planes

LD2306161791 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1500 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] The Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia protested in the sharpest terms today to the Yugoslav Presidency because of an incident that took place on Friday, 21 June, when members of the Yugoslav Peoples' Army [JNA] from the Brnik air base [near Ljubljana] took away 12 "Kragulj" aircraft [used for light fighter and trainer] from the Slovene Territorial Defense, reports the SLOVENE NEWS AGENCY. The Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia demands that the aircraft be returned immediately to their home air base. The protest by the Slovene Presidency stresses that the renewed arbitrary activity of the JNA is obviously directed against the sovereignty of the Republic of Slovenia and is not contributing to the calming of tension, which is necessary for an agreement on the settling of relations with the JNA, and the procedure for the dissociation of Slovenia.

Relations Within Croatia Concern Only Croatia

LD2406103591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0942 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 24 Jun (TANJUG)—I have always maintained and I repeat now that an agreement on relations with the Serbs in Croatia must be resolved in Croatia, said Prime Minister Ante Markovic in the Croatian Assembly today.

Relations between Croats and Serbs cannot be negotiated between Zagreb and Belgrade. Their arrangement can be agreed on within Croatia only and with the citizens of Croatia. Any talks outside of this framework will lead to polarization and not to solutions as required by the process of democratization in our society, Markovic said.

Croatia's Manolic Interviewed on Secession

AU2206213691 Belgrade RTV Sat TV in Serbo-Croatian 1730 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Interview with Croatian Prime Minister Josip Manolic in Zagreb, by Mihajlo Kovac, in Belgrade—live]

[Text] [Kovac] The quest of this news program is Croatian Prime Minister Josip Manolic. There is no need to particularly stress the reason for this. The Croatian Assembly has been rapidly, I would say hastily, continuously adopting a fairly large packet of bills whose ultimate aim is, as stated, the realization of a sovereign and independent state of Croatia. Mr. Manolic, I hope that at least this television link between Belgrade and Zagreb functions well.

Judging by the press reports, my impression is that the assembly deputies themselves are not absolutely clear where and what the finishing line is. You must certainly be clear about that and I would like to ask you to answer whether Croatia is dissociating, becoming independent, seceding, or whether it only wants to achieve a higher level of sovereignty than it has enjoyed up to now, something that cannot be denied?

[Manolic] I think that there are several unknowns in this and some misunderstanding about it. Many wonder whether this is secession, as you said, whether this is dissociation, and what the difference between these two are. I think that there is an essential difference between these two. We are entering the process of dissociation—what has been built in Yugoslavia with joint forces and this means 70 years that have been woven in this Yugoslavia, as well as blood, sweat, work, suffering, understanding and misunderstanding in this former old and new Yugoslavia. Therefore, material goods were created, so were spiritual goods. All this has now been subjected to this process of dissociation.

[Kovac] It is a fact that for some time you have simply not been accepting and implementing many federal regulations and institutions, that you have been suspending them. It is also a fact that the representatives of Croatia still sit in the bodies of the federal assembly. What is the real Croatia, what is Croatia's real behavior: the one in the federal assembly, or the one at home?

[Manolic] This process of disintegration or eating into the Federal Constitution began much earlier. Nobody, not a single republic has been spared from this. Every one of them has been demanding space for itself to protect its rights, to protect its own interests.

[Kovac] There are two ways to defend one's own interests. It is obvious that some are doing it with the wish to stay in Yugoslavia while others to leave it. However, I would like to return to what the Croatian Assembly has been doing in the last few days. One of the laws adopted is the law on Croatian citizenship. Milan Ramljak, vice president of your government, presented it as, I quote, a star-studded moment of this glorious Croat Assembly. The law is dominated by the principle of the so-called blood-tie [krvna sveza]. My question is: How can members of the Serbian people in Croatia, hypothetically, deserve citizenship on the territory on which they were otherwise born, as well as their predecessors.

[Manolic] In the same way as the Croats. The same principles that were presented equally to Croats just as they do to the Serbs.

[Kovac] My confusion is caused by a provision according to which the request for granting citizenship will be approved if an organ, that has so far not been named yet, concludes on the basis of the citizens'

behavior that they respect the legal system and customs in Croatia and accept Croatian culture. How, for instance, should the Italians in Istria and the Hungarians in the north of Croatia, according to you, accept Croatian culture?

[Manolic] I do not see that Serbs or any other people that live on the territory of Croatia can but accept Croatian culture, for instance. Whether this is done in this or that way—we will not ask people to declare that they must know all Croat poets, that they must know literature and so forth.

However, one must not work against this culture, one must not work against this culture by any acts. If this is the case, then this would be incorrect. If I want to live in another country I must adapt to the life of that country, I must respect the customs of the people who are there, who live there. I also do not see any obstacles for Serbs or other minorities that should be excluded or in a certain way discriminated against in this work.

[Kovac] Mr. Manolic, you are familiar with the decision of the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina, which you do not recognize, that if Croatia secedes, it wants to join the rest of Yugoslavia. Let me elaborate on this. We have the reaction of the international community that presented clearly its stand in Berlin several days ago that it is against the unilateral alterations of borders.

[Manolic] We are not talking about secession. There is nobody in Yugoslavia who could secede from Yugoslavia. This must be clear to you Serbs. Yugoslavia came into being through the voluntary association of people. If it has come into being through association, then there can only be dissociation. This is the process which we want. This is the process that will not be in conflict with the policy of the United States nor the policy of Western Europe. On the contrary, it will become part of this policy and I think will be supported by this policy.

[Kovac] Therefore, dissociation rather then secession. Respected viewers, you have heard the Croatian Prime Minister Josip Manolic, whose answers could be considered the official side of the Croatian political medal. There is no doubt that the conversation has helped toward clarifying things, I refer above all to the Serbian people in Croatia again being reduced to a minority, and even a suggestion that they live in some other state. This is in fact what the Croatian Prime Minister said.

Izetbegovic on Imminent Division of Republic

AU2406094291 Vienna PROFIL in German 24 Jun 91 p 74

[Interview with Bosnia-Hercegovina President Alija Izetbegovic by Rudolf Gruber in Sarajevo; date not given: "We Will Fight"]

[Text] [Gruber] Mr. President, last week you met again with your colleagues from Croatia and Serbia. The talks are being kept secret. Are you negotiating about new orders within Yugoslavia?

[Izetbegovic] The issue is the role of Croatia and Serbia in Bosnia-Hercegovina and the future of Yugoslavia. Everything depends on the relations between the various peoples. As is known, there is great uncertainty, but a solution cannot consist in correcting the borders but only in expanding democracy.

[Gruber] At the first three-man summit in Split one could see you on television pacing nervously while the presidents of Croatia and Serbia talked to you making vehement gestures. What did they want of you?

[Izetbegovic] The issue was the press release after the meeting. I said that I agreed to everything. I would sign any agreement with my eyes closed if it was signed by Tudjman and Milosevic at the same time. But under one precondition: that the integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina is guaranteed.

[Gruber] Did you also say that otherwise you would fight for the freedom of your republic?

[Izetbegovic] We Bosnians will fight. Two million Muslims live here; the other two peoples—Serbs and Croats—are too few to be able to devour us....

[Gruber] Greater Croatia and Grater Serbia could do that.

[Izetbegovic] I am convinced that Greater Croatia and Greater Serbia are not realistic goals, regardless of who is dreaming of them.

[Gruber] The nationalistic parties in your republic are busy with comprehensive arms transports; you can keep your coalition together only with great effort.

[Izetbegovic] This applies above all to the relationship between the Muslim and the Serbian party. The (Muslim) SDA [Party of Democratic Action] first stresses the future of Bosnia-Hercegovina and then that of Yugoslavia; the (Serbian) SDS [Serbian Democratic Party] does things the other way round. Everyone seems to be importing weapons. A police check has shown that all strata of society seem to be armed. The reason for this

is fear of a civil war. The investigation showed that the Serbian population has most of the arms, then come the Croats, then the Muslims. But all have enough weapons to kill each other.

[Gruber] Are you not afraid that the price for peace between Serbs and Croats may be the division of your republic?

[Izetbegovic] On this territory there are no specific national areas; everything is mixed. How should one divide them?

[Gruber] In an interview with PROFIL, Croatian Prime Minister Josip Manolic expressed speculations about resettlement campaigns.

[Izetbegovic] I read the interview. I think that the resettlement of people was an appropriate policy for Hitler and Stalin but not for our time. I also think that the figure given by Manolic of a total of 400,000 people is a gross underestimation; resettlement would affect at least twice as many.

[Gruber] Could Bosnia-Hercegovina again become a central problem for Europe?

[Izetbegovic] Peace in Yugoslavia depends on peace in Bosnia-Hercegovina. Peace in Europe depends on peace in Yugoslavia. Once before a world war emerged from our soil. Therefore, Europe should watch carefully what is happening here in our country.